The Jew Through The Centuries

Herbert L. Willett

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

PRESENTED BY

John Stuart Conning, D.D.

DS 117 .W5 1932 c.2
Willett, Herbert L. 1864-
1944.
The Jew through the
centuries

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/jewthroughcentur00will_0

THE JEW THROUGH
THE CENTURIES

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 14 1942
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE JEW THROUGH THE CENTURIES

By HERBERT L. WILLETT

Willett, Clark and Company
Chicago: 440 South Dearborn Street
New York: 200 Fifth Avenue

Copyright 1932 by
WILLETT, CLARK & COMPANY

Manufactured in The U. S. A. by The Plimpton Press
Norwood, Mass.-LaPorte, Ind.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION . 1

I . PALESTINE . 23

II . HEBREW ORIGINS . 71

III . HEBREW CONTACTS, ACCRETIONS AND DISPERSIONS . 87

IV . FALL OF JUDAH: CLOSE OF HEBREW HISTORY . 104

V . THE RISE OF JUDAISM . 132

VI . PRIESTHOOD AND GENEALOGIES . 166

VII . THE GROWTH OF JUDAISM . 189

VIII . JEW AND CHRISTIAN . 224

IX . THE END OF THE JEWISH STATE . 258

X . THE JEW THROUGH THE CENTURIES . 279

XI . THE RISE OF ZIONISM . 314

XII . JEW AND ARAB IN PALESTINE . 344

XIII . THE JEW TODAY AND TOMORROW . 382

BIBLIOGRAPHY . 407

INDEXES . 415

THE JEW THROUGH
THE CENTURIES

INTRODUCTION

One of the most interesting racial groups known to history is the Jewish people. They have been rightly called " the Burning Bush " of the centuries, ever burning, yet never consumed. Without a country, yet citizens of all lands; unhappy and undesired wherever they have gone, yet contributing everywhere to the welfare and prosperity of their adopted homes, they have been the migrant race beyond all others, the veritable " wandering Jews." For almost two and a half millenniums they have exhibited to the world the strange paradox of the utmost variety of experiences, distribution, speech, customs, complexion and social strata, and at the same time a singular coherence in racial sentiment and religious conviction. In their ranks they have included statesmen and councillors, all the way from Nehemiah to Disraeli, philosophers from the son of Sirach to Spinoza, scientists from Maimonides to Einstein, and philanthropists from Baron Hirsch to Nathan Straus and Julius Rosenwald.

They have furnished the world many of its merchant princes, its masters of commerce and its barons of the banking profession. In strange contrast among them are to be found in all ages the most desperately poor, pickers of rags, collectors and sellers of old bottles, and multitudes living on the fringes of the social order. No people has ever been at the same time so powerful and so disesteemed. Certain persistent racial traits have set the Jew apart as clever, resourceful, successful, pushful and clannish, and therefore as undesirable as a neighbor and unwelcome as an immigrant. Most of these characteristics are the result, not of his religion, as is often mistakenly affirmed, but of the unhappy race prejudice resulting from the very qualities which have made him successful in competition with less energetic peoples.

The Jews have been the children of sorrow, the product of dispersion on the one side, and of the ghetto and the pale on the other. They have been subjected to every type of oppression, persecution, outrage and spoliation. They have been hunted out of the lands where they thought they had found a home, forbidden callings open to other people, shut up in precincts which were both a refuge and a prison, tortured for their money or because of their faith, and compelled by the enginery of churchly persecution to abjure their religion and conform to a creed they abhorred. Their numbers have suffered depletion in every period of their history, from massacre, from desertion due to the hardships to which they were subjected, from silent withdrawal to the protection of other social groups, and from constant though never approved intermarriage with non-Jewish families. Had it not been for these depletions, the Jews might well form today one of the most numerous sections of the world's population, rather than the comparatively small company they include. Furthermore, in spite of their limited numbers and their coherence, they exhibit the most diverse racial types, the result of the constant intermixture of blood, dispersion into all parts of the world, and subjection to every form of oppression and violence.

This interesting and historic people came into being in Palestine in the fifth century B.C. It was the result of the heroic efforts of two men of the Hebrew race to rehabilitate the ancient capital of their fathers, then in desolation. Successive dispersions had brought the older Hebrew nationalities to their end. A mixed race from their beginnings, they had organized the kingdom of Israel under David and Solomon, a kingdom that was broken asunder at the time of the revolt of the ten tribes in 937 B.C. The two resulting fragments continued their career, Israel until 721, when it was washed out by Assyria, and Judah until 586, when Jerusalem fell under Babylonian assaults, and the little area was reduced to ruin. The least resourceful of the inhabitants lingered in the province. Most departed, either as expatriates to Babylonia, or as refugees to Egypt and other neighboring lands.

Judah was left prostrate and desolate. The picture presented by Ezekiel, himself a witness, is sufficiently depressing. It was the hope of the best of the race, like that prophet and the Second Isaiah, that there might be a return of the people or their children from the east, and a restoration of Jerusalem. Of this hope there was no realization. The story of the "return," so called, if the testimony of the contemporary sources can be trusted, was a myth, the result of later Jewish effort to connect the new Jewish community with the historic Israel. With the downfall of Babylonia and the coming of the Persian rule an attempt was made by some of the remnant in Judah, led by Haggai and Zechariah the courageous prophets, with whatever help certain pilgrims from the east such as Zerubbabel and the priest Joshua could offer. A new temple was begun on the ruins of the old, but it was disappointingly small, and it took years to complete it, meagre as it was. The colony was small, feeble and discouraged. The later glimpse afforded by the anonymous fragment called Malachi is still more depressing, and references in the Psalms indicate that fresh tragedies befell the city and its vicinity. The ancient Hebrew people was no more. Groups here and there in the east and in Egypt cherished the classic writings and tried to observe the Deuteronomic law. But with rare exceptions the Hebrews had been absorbed into the nations around them, and the only heritage left was the body of scriptures that had thus far taken form, and the memory of the great prophetic ministries of the past.

It was in the year 445 B.C., the twentieth of Artaxerxes I of Persia, that a delegation of men from Judah waited on Nehemiah, a chamberlain and confident of the Persian king at Susa, and presented to him the lamentable story of Jerusalem in ruins, the temple destroyed, the population small, conglomerate and in great distress, and the candle of Israel all but completely quenched. Stirred by this pathetic recital, Nehemiah secured leave of absence from the king and, accompanied by a military guard and bearing credentials of his mission, made the long journey to Jerusalem and took up the difficult work of governor of the province. His Journal, which forms the nucleus of the book that bears his name, gives the record of his achievements during the next dozen or more years, including the rebuilding of the city walls, the organization of the administration, the institution of reforms among the mixed and uninstructed people of the city, now taking on new life, and some effort to preserve the small remnant of Hebrew stock from intermarriage with the other peoples represented in the population. Though the stock of

Israel had been swept away by repeated invasion, deportation and massacre, the memories of the past remained, and the sacred writings that had taken form were cherished and held in reverence by at least a fragment of the citizenship. It was the effort of the devoted and heroic governor to salvage something if possible of the older life of Palestine as the basis for the new community.

A few years later, in 397 B.C., the seventh of Artaxerxes II, there arrived in the city the man to whom the Jewish people and Judaism owed more than to any other as founder and fashioner. This was Ezra the scribe, who brought with him from Babylonia that expansion of the laws of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel which is usually known as the Priest Code. It was apparently the work of a circle of Hebrews in the east, who believed that the revival of the national fortunes, shattered by successive shocks of war and expatriation, depended upon the acceptance and strict observance of a body of laws far more exacting and priestly than those the lost Hebrew state had known. This code, with its elaborate priestly ritual and its minute and specific rules of the sanctuary, was brought by the eager and ardent reformer, who took up at once the task of bringing the people of the province to a more satisfactory moral and religious estate.

Conditions were far worse than he could have imagined. The population was of the most mixed and nondescript character. It included people of all the neighboring races, who had freely intermarried, producing a composite group that spoke a patois far removed from the speech of Judah in the old days. Even the men who claimed to be of priestly and Levitical blood had ignored if they had ever known the prescribed limitations of their caste. Things could hardly be worse. Ezra at once instituted measures of the most drastic sort to correct these abuses. The guilty officials were compelled to swear to send away the foreign wives and their children, though it might be difficult to tell who was foreign and who was native in such a complex company. Of course nothing came of it. It was impossible to enforce such an unsocial edict. The account appears to be the work of an author writing at a much later time in the interest of racial purity and legal exactness. In reality neither the Hebrews of the classic age nor the Jews of the later time were ever of untainted blood. The Old Testament is the authentic narrative of such frequent invasions, infiltrations, subjugations, intermixtures and alliances as rendered incredible any idea of a segregated racial stock among the Hebrews. And with beginnings so miscellaneous, and a succession of permeations, removals and later dispersions into every part of the world, accompanied by cruel treatment, outrages, ravishment and oppression of unimaginable forms, the claim of unsullied stock can hardly be made for the Jew of modern times, or of any of the historic periods since the days of Ezra, the founder of the race.

It is continuity of land inheritance, unbroken linguistic tradition, and measurably peaceful political experience that can validate the title to legitimate clan inheritance and racial continuity. Few groups in the mingled population of the western world can make that assertion today. The modern Italian is a far cry from the Roman of the classic day in spite of Mussolini's doctrine of nationalism. The Greek of today is far nearer in racial traits, speech and manners to the Albanian and the Turk than to the Greek of the age of Pericles. And the Jew of the present generation has few of the credentials of continuity belonging even to these races. His persistence is due to his faith in his religion, built like the Christian confession upon the foundations of the Old Testament, to his intense monotheism, to the disciplines of his ritual observances which have been a protection, a shell of conformity through the centuries, and perhaps chiefly to the persecutions he has suffered, whose effects are disclosed in his psychology, his mannerisms, his speech and his type of culture. In fact most of his peculiarities, aside from his basic faith in the one God, which he shares with Christian and Moslem, are defense mechanisms, to which he was in large measure forced by the cruelties and exactions of an unsocial environment. He has adopted, wherever possible, the strategy and technique of the people among whom he has lived. He has taken over their names as a means of disguise until there are few Jews today who do not bear German, Polish, Russian, French, Spanish or English names. In innumerable instances by intermarriage or the adoption of another creed he has sought to escape persecution or social ostracism. History presents the pathetic spectacle of this gifted and serviceable people attempting in all periods and lands to evade the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, chiefly the result of Christian race prejudice and brutality.

There was no authentic connection of any class of the citizenship of Judah with the past. The repeated destruction of Jerusalem and its archives not only explains the loss of those many biographical and historical documents cited so frequently and so tantalizingly in the Old Testament, but discounts completely the supposition that there could have been preserved the genealogies of the priesthood, of the tribe of Levi, or in fact of any other tribe. Yet these fictions persisted, and it is not surprising that claims were made by talmudic writers, in the spirit of the Chronicler, that every Jew, much more every priest, could trace his line back to his tribal ancestor. In fact there continued through the centuries, and prevails even to the present time among some Jews, the belief that tribal groups were preserved intact, and that an individual could claim descent from a designated tribal unit. It is asserted in the Talmud that there were eighteen camel-loads of exposition of one of the genealogical lists in Chronicles. But Josephus, who claimed for himself a priestly descent, writes that at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus all the priestly records were consumed.

The Jewish community in Jerusalem in the fourth century B.C. was in no way a continuation of the Hebrew state of the days of David, Hezekiah, Josiah, Zerubbabel and Zechariah, but was a new community organized by the heroic efforts of the two leaders, Nehemiah and Ezra, and was made up of a variety of racial elements from the near-by regions, in which amalgam the Edomites were probably the largest factor, and in which the surviving Hebrews, either those remaining in the province or those who came from abroad, were a weak minority. But however complex was the group, and however tenuous its connection with the Hebrew past, the men who were the leaders had, in spite of seemingly insurmountable obstacles, the courage and enthusiasm to mold the unpromising material into a coherent and hardy community on the only pattern that could have survived, that of a company of mixed stock, and therefore all the more vital and efficient as such stocks have always proved, organized as a religious and not a political unit, and capable therefore of enduring hardship in the interest of their new law and their priestly cultus.

Of the years that followed there is no constructive record. The Samaritan community at Shechem was evidently denied any participation in the Jewish enterprise, and must have constructed its temple on Mt. Gerizim as a token of the distinct break with Judaism. At the same time the Torah, the five books of Moses, became the sacred scriptures of this group, and has continued to hold that place to this day. In the matter of zeal for the law and purity of race the Samaritans have claimed superiority to the Jews, whom they regard as apostates from the faith of the Hebrew fathers. The friction between the two communities was more or less constant, the Jews reacting with bitterness to the disdain of the Samaritans. Probably a good deal of blood was shed across the border. One can discern the sentiment of the Jews in the pages of the New Testament, which was the natural expression of their resentment at the charge that they were a mixed and upstart race, with no claim to the sanctions of the Hebrew institutions.

Somewhere in this period there are hints of fresh tragedies that befell Jerusalem, probably in the reign of Artaxerxes III, Ochus. Hints supplied by some of the Psalms and the late sections of Isaiah and Zechariah throw a lurid light upon the unhappy estate of the faithful in Judah, whose misfortunes were heightened by the conduct of apostates as well as the cruelties of enemies. In such periods of suffering and in connection with such events are to be discovered the beginnings of the apocalyptic spirit, which, now that prophecy had ceased, became an increasingly useful medium of religious instruction and national encouragement. Something of this spirit is seen in the book of Joel, whose author, like many of his fellow religionists, thought of a dispersed but interested Judaism among the nations, which might be expected to return to Zion and assist in its enlargement and enrichment. Some such arriving pilgrims there were from time to time, but their numbers were few, and their help negligible.

There were two contrasted views in the Jewish community regarding its relation to the outside world. Emphasizing as it did the idea that it was the successor and legatee of the Hebrew commonwealth, it was possible to follow the nationalistic leadership of Ezekiel, to whom Israel was the all-important consideration, and its priestly future the object of solicitude and hope, or to accept the broader view of the Second Isaiah, to whom Israel was not an end in itself, but the divinely appointed means of bringing salvation to the nations. In the Jerusalem of the fourth and third centuries there were already advocates of each of these points of view.

During all periods of Hebrew history contact with Egypt had been constant, and communities had grown up there that were more or less in contact with the two kingdoms of the north and, after their disappearance, with the new Jewish organization in Jerusalem. Refugees had sought an asylum in the land of the Nile, as the closing chapter in the life of Jeremiah shows, and papyrus records from the island of Elephantine near Assouan show that there was a Hebrew colony located there in the twenty-sixth dynasty, about the time that Nehemiah was erecting the walls of Jerusalem. In the years that followed this migration of Jews from Judah to Egypt continued, due partly to trading opportunities, partly to the greater security offered there, and partly to the chance for military service, which as we know took some of them as far as Nubia. These emigrants from Palestine were probably of the same mixed type as the population of Jerusalem, though their opportunities for segregation were perhaps superior to those of the people of Judah. The colony at Elephantine mingled its worship of Ya'u or Jahveh with offerings to other deities.

The meteoric career of Alexander the Great changed the face of the world and affected the Jewish community as it did all others from the Aegean to the Indus. The Persian power was washed out of Palestine, and the country found itself the unhappy buffer state between the two Greek dominions of Syria on the north and Egypt on the south. The campaigns of Alexander were hardly more than triumphal advances through the vast east, and his empire soon fell to pieces. But he left over the wide areas of his dominion the imperishable influence of the Greek language and culture. His warriors who were scattered along the highways of Asia Minor, Syria, Persia and India became the interpreters and propagandists of Hellenic speech and ideas. Presently the Greek civilization was the dominant force from Egypt to the Aegean, and was even extending into the near east. Between the two capitals — Antioch and Alexandria — lay Palestine, in which the growing Jerusalem had come to possess increasing control. The stage was thus set for the four-fold drama which through the following centuries brought the Jews into the light of world recognition in four thrilling acts. These were the translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek, the Maccabean revolution, the rise of Christianity and the Roman war. These events put the Jew on the map and made him a subject of interest in the entire Graeco-Roman world.

Syria and Egypt were Greek in their culture and religion. Naturally this influence spread through the entire area. Greek speech, Greek manners, Greek amusements and the Greek cultus became increasingly popular. Hebrew had already given way to Aramaic as the *lingua franca* of Palestine, and now Greek was rapidly taking its place. The large Jewish population of Alexandria desired a version of the Hebrew scriptures in a language they could read, and in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 250 B.C., some of their scholars set about the task of making a translation. This work was not completed for a century or more, but it gave to the cultural world of the time some knowledge of a literature which up to this time had held but a small place in the regard of any save the later Hebrews and the Jews. It was called the Septuagint, or the Seventy (LXX). It was also the Bible of the New Testament church.

The Maccabean revolution was an uprising of the more conservative elements in the population of Judah against the increasing spread of Greek ideas among them. So popular had the Hellenic fashions and customs become that Jewish youths were adopting the dress and manners of the pagan world about them. Gymnasia and baths were erected in

Jerusalem, the Hermes cap was the common style, Greek debating societies were fostered, and there were sinister tokens of a complete abandonment of the law and the temple service. Perhaps if matters had been left to their rapidly-moving course Judaism would have perished in its own home. It was the attempt of the Syrian king, Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, to complete this process by forcible means which roused the faithful and saved the structure Ezra had reared. Mattathias Hasmon, belonging to one of the minor priestly families, and living in the town of Modein on the shephela, raised the standard of revolt against Syria in 167 B.C. In the following years his son Judas Maccabaeus ("the Hammer") won a series of victories over armies far stronger than he could muster, and died heroically in battle. His brothers Jonathan and Simon secured the independence of Judah, partly by the diplomatic aid of Rome, into whose hands however these contacts unfortunately betrayed the nation to its later undoing. The age of the Maccabees was the most brilliant in the political history of Judaism, and promoted still further the recognition of Judaism by the world of that age. The later years were marred by family intrigues and rivalries, which were brought to an end by the arrival of Pompey the Roman general in 63 B.C. Meantime Antipater, an Edomite or Idumean, a member of that race which had been driven gradually from its rocky home by the Nabateans, and had encroached ever farther into Judah until Hebron became its capital, was made a general by the Maccabean Alexander Jannaeus, given a Jewish pedigree and honored in the state. His son was Herod, called the Great, and in the hands of these Edomites the last remnants of Maccabean power vanished. Herod married Mariamne the heiress of the Hasmonian line; he then murdered her, a treatment he accorded most of the other members of his family. Thus came to its close the brief period of Jewish independence and glory.

The rise of Christianity was the third of the events which gave Judaism its conspicuous place in the thought of the world, for it was against the background of Judaism that Jesus and his first interpreters projected their activities, and no one can read the pages of the New Testament without having constantly brought to his attention the Jewish institutions, rites and services and attitude of mind. Since the years of Ezra Judaism had gone on developing its legal ideals and its sensitiveness to the teachings of the Torah. The Mosaic institutes rose to a sacredness undreamed of in earlier days. Judaism seemed willing to accept any type of political tyranny provided it was left undisturbed in its elaboration of the law and its devotion to the Levitical requirements. Of these the temple was the symbol. The Building and the Book, the Temple and the Torah, were the chief objects of rabbinical and popular regard. In them Judaism found its glory and its joy. In this regard it reached back to the legal interests which had begun to develop so rapidly in the old Hebrew state, only that now since political ambitions were reduced to the minimum the loyalties to Levitical procedure had ampler place in the life of the community. There was in this both the power and the peril of Judaism. It is difficult to see how it could have survived during the tragic days of the Roman war and the long centuries that followed without this apparently hard shell of legalism, in the elaboration and observance of which the saintly souls in the Jewish organization have found a refuge from external tragedies that might well have extinguished a less hardy and persistent race.

On the other hand there were always those in the Jerusalem community who held the broader outlook of the Second Isaiah, of Jonah and the author of Ruth. They could not believe that the function of Zion was limited to its own life. There must be broader interests for those who shared the ideals of the great prophets of the Hebrew past. The political, social and religious conditions of Jerusalem were more and more disturbing. Frequent hopes were expressed that some prophet, teacher or deliverer would appear who would usher in the better day. When John the Baptist appeared he was hailed by many as this expected messenger of God, and multitudes gathered to listen to his words and to enroll themselves in the new movement. Among these was Jesus of Nazareth who had come apparently hoping to find in John the leader, for whom he and the thousands of his countrymen, especially those from the north, were waiting. Soon there came to him the conviction that he and not John was the expected leader. His brief ministry of a little more than three years was occupied in teaching, preaching and healing. All these he insisted he did by the authority of God and the power of the divine spirit. He called about him a little company of disciples whom in a series of journeys up and down the land he undertook to train for the interpretation and expansion of his plans when as he clearly foresaw he could no longer be with them. His ministry was hailed with enthusiasm at first, but poisoned by the insinuations of the leaders of church and state the popular mind turned away from him and he fell a victim to ecclesiastical hostility and mob fury, sanctioned by Roman authority.

His cause seemed totally lost. However, the affection and confidence which he had inspired in his growing company of followers were too great to be quenched, and after his death some of these disciples began the preaching of his program of which he had spoken as the kingdom of God. At first the movement was local and more or less popular with the Jews of the capital. Some of the priests even became members of the order. But later, especially after the appearance of Stephen the Hellenist, the situation changed and a growing antagonism arose. This was brought to its head by the conversion of Saul, a young and ardent Jewish rabbi, to the new faith. It was the life work of this man to translate the gospel of Jesus from the limits of Palestine to the Graeco-Roman world, and from this time onward the attitude of the two groups was unfortunately increasingly suspicious and hostile. In reading through the New Testament one wonders whether this attitude was justified. The Fourth Gospel uses constantly the word "Jew" with the meaning of an enemy of Jesus and the Christian movement. Many of the words reported as uttered by our Lord regarding the scribes and Pharisees seem less the disclosure of his wide and tolerant spirit than the hot reactions of the later missionary enterprise in its constant friction with Jewish legalists, both in Palestine and in the diaspora.

From this time forth the two movements, both of which were daughter developments of the Hebrew faith, went their divided ways, Christianity to become within a few years the official religion of the empire and Judaism to fall increasingly into the unhappy estate of a persecuted and despised religion. All this was unfortunate and unnecessary. Jesus was the most conspicuous contribution Judaism ever gave to the world. His first followers and interpreters were nearly all of that race. He loved his people, as did his chief apostle, who insisted that he would be willing to become anathema for the sake of his brethren according to the flesh. The fault for this estrangement belongs both to Christians and to Jews, though more to the former than to the latter. There has hardly been a generation which has not seen unprovoked assaults upon one or another of the many communities of the Jews instigated and carried on by rough and brutal leaders claiming the sanction of the Christian faith. The Christian holidays of Christmas and Easter have been days of terror to the Jewish population of most of the lands in which they have lived. Christianity has an uncounted tale of crimes for which to make reparations before its account with Judaism is closed. And generally its only approach to an understanding has been through aggressive and therefore quite impossible attempts at the conversion of this unhappy people.

The Jewish-Roman war was the fourth of the movements which brought the Jews to the notice of the world. Growing restlessness, agitation of the Zealot party against high taxes, aggravated by acts of ruthless discipline on the part of Roman officials, brought on the tragedy. The whole province of Palestine flamed into revolt in the days of 68 and 69 A.D. An uncounted number of Jews from many lands had come to Jerusalem for the annual celebration of the Passover. This increased the horror of the war. The Roman general Vespasian began the siege and Titus his son completed it. The awfulness of the tragedy was heightened by the internal conflicts between fanatical Jewish leaders. Jerusalem was taken and completely destroyed. The temple and palaces went up in flames, its people were slaughtered by thousands in the streets, its walls were laboriously overthrown and the very site was plowed and sown with salt. Josephus, whose narrative is our most authentic record, estimates that not less than a million and a half Jews perished in this bloody catastrophe.

That was the end of Jewish history. Titus decreed that no Jews were to be allowed in Palestine. But Jamnia, a town on the slopes of Judah toward the Philistine plain, was permitted to become the cultural center of the remnant of Jews, sharing in later days that honor with Tiberias and Safed in the north. The Jews were unable to remain content with this rough and brutal ending of their national life. Repeatedly after this, as well as in earlier days, they revolted against Rome. These efforts culminated in the revolution inaugurated by Joseph bar-Cochba in 135 A.D. Again the city fell under Roman wrath. Hadrian destroyed it completely and later erected a Roman city on its site, with a temple to Isis and an equestrian statue to the emperor on the site. No Jews were allowed to enter the city on pain of death. The name of Jew became one of disgrace, and in most places the garments he was compelled to wear were badges of dishonor.

From that time to this the Jews have been wanderers and exiles driven from place to place as they searched for rest and protection, or subjected to nameless outrages and massacres if they attempted to defend themselves. The story of Christian treatment of the Jew is one of the damning records of history. They wandered into all lands from which they were not forcibly restrained. Russia, Poland, Spain, Hungary, North Africa, Rumania, Austria and in a less degree lands farther west have been the asylums they have sought. Christian assemblies like the third and fourth Lateran Councils decreed that Christians could not take service with Jews, and that the Jew must wear a special badge of disgrace, which was usually the gabardine and fur cap. They were forced to attend at sermons, and strict censorship or actual confiscation and destruction of Jewish literature was customary. The absurd charge of ritual murder brought against them by ignorant and superstitious people seemed to justify outbreaks of cruel violence against them. They were refused permission to cultivate the soil or to engage in most of the honorable trades, limitations which reduced them to the necessity of becoming money changers, a calling in which apparently in spite of repeated plunderings by rulers and other officials, they prospered. The terrible enginery of the Inquisition was invoked against them both in England and Spain. In the latter country the expulsion of Jews as well as Moors in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella brought irreparable disaster both to the exiles and to the land which had treated them with such severity.

It is not strange therefore that Jews are to be found today in almost every part of the world, where they have sought refuge from persecution or an opportunity to earn a livelihood. In some instances they have kept their racial isolation, and in others they have amalgamated with the native stock, producing Jews of strangely mixed physiognomy and speech. On the whole, however, their numbers are no greater than they were nineteen hundred years ago, rather less.

One can easily understand how, considering that natural race prejudice which even the most enlightened nations appear to possess, the Jew with his striking though never wholly persistent physical characteristics, his economic pushfulness and cleverness, and his tendency to manners that mark him out as peculiar, has become too often the object of dislike and avoidance. He is the child and the product of the ghetto. He has all the furtive characteristics of the hunted and the oppressed. Only in recent years in western Europe and the United States has he come to his own. And this is unquestionably the reason for his deep gratitude to the peoples of these lands and his unselfish devotion to the causes of philanthropy in behalf of his own and other classes, and his efforts to reduce as far as possible the burden of race prejudice against groups even more unfortunate than his own.

In the case of the Jew that prejudice is a real problem; for though members of that race are often victims of an inferiority complex as they view the relation of their people to other races, there lies at the back of their minds a just sentiment of historic worth derived from centuries of scholarly achievement in Palestine, in the schools of Jamnia, Safed and Tiberias, in Mesopotamia in the academies of Sura, Mehardea and Pompedita, as well as in numberless enterprises, institutions and homes throughout western Europe and America. As one of them has recently written, "To be born a Jew is to be born to a satyric comedy; often to be the clown that is slapped; sometimes to be momently the courtier and next moment the vassal, and always to be the immortal who laughs at the Dynasties and Empires and Principalities that fought to destroy him and themselves perished." The first step in a truly promising approach to more appreciative relations with Judaism on the part of all other religious and secular groups is a higher estimate of the splendid contribution made by this race to civilization, and a just appraisal of the intolerable wrongs perpetrated against it under non-Jewish and dominantly Christian auspices. Such an assessment of the facts ought to lead to a humbling consciousness of responsibility, and the hope of a more friendly and constructive future.

In the following chapters the facts thus briefly related in this introductory section are elaborated with fuller detail and documentation, and the discussion of present day Judaism, particularly in connection with the Zionist phase of its development, is presented. Palestine was the first home of Judaism, and of Zionism it is the vital interest. With that land in a general way the Jew has felt his connection through the centuries. It is therefore appropriate that a brief study of its more important features should precede the consideration of the problems connected with Judaism. The land and its various peoples have intimate relations, and of these peoples the Jews and the Arabs have an impressive and continuing interest in the country and in each other, which under wise leadership may develop into substantial values for religion and civilization.

NOTE. The divine name Jahveh (pronounced Yahweh) used in this book is believed by scholars to be the form of the covenant name of deity represented in the Hebrew text by the *tetragrammaton* or four-letter term "JHVH." It was regarded as mystically sacred and was not pronounced by the Jews; wherever it occurred in the text the word "Adonai" (my Lord) was substituted for it in the reading. By using the vowels of "Adonai" with the consonants "JHVH" the word "Jehovah" was contrived, which of course was neither a Hebrew nor an English word. It is an artificial form which only long usage in English Bibles could excuse. It seems better to employ the word in the form which we know from Greek renderings to have been its real pronunciation, or else use the translation LORD, as is done in most of the English versions. The word "Jehovah" has only the value of long and reverent usage, and rests on no authentic foundation.

I

PALESTINE

Of all lands known to the historian it is probable that Palestine possesses the greatest general interest. It was the home of the ancient Hebrews, the first interpreters of monotheism.[1] It is the "holy land" to Jews, Samaritans, Christians and Moslems in virtue of their several contacts and associations with it in the past and the present. In all ages it has been the bridge across which the nations have passed in migrations, campaigns or merchandising caravans in either direction between the grass lands of Mesopotamia and Egypt. In early Christian centuries it was the land of heart's desire to thousands of penitents and pilgrims who left their bones in its soil. It was the magnet that drew half Europe to the adventure of the crusades. And in later days increasing numbers of travelers from all lands have made it their goal. Most recently events connected with the World War and the recovery of the country from Turkish rule have set in motion significant enterprises such as the new political alignment of the country, its agricultural and industrial development, the activities and ideals of Zionism, and the fresh interest awakened in archaeological research.

---

[1] Tradition affirmed that Moses described it to the expectant Hebrews in these terms (Deut. 11:10–12): "For the land whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs: but the land, whither ye go to possess it, is a land of hills and valleys, and drinketh water of the rain of heaven; a land which the Lord thy God careth for; the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year."

It would appear that after centuries of stagnation under an inefficient and plundering administration, Palestine is at last coming to a new day.

It is a little land. It lies along the southern third of the slanting Mediterranean coast which runs retreatingly from its north-eastward thrust near ancient Antioch southward to the long curve that reaches Egypt. It forms the south-western arc of the fertile crescent that curves upward from the Persian Gulf and bends down to the valley of the Nile. From the border of the French mandate of Syria near Beirut it extends south a distance of 140 miles to the borders of the Tih desert. Its traditional limits were from Dan at the sources of the Jordan under Lebanon to Beersheba the city of the seven wells far south in the Negeb. Its breadth ranges from 23 miles in the north to 80 at the southern limit. The area is given as 6000 square miles west of the Jordan and about 3800 square miles east of that trench, a total area about equal to the state of Massachusetts or the principality of Wales. It is bounded on the north by the mountain masses of the Lebanons, whose parallel ranges run north and south, separated by the wide valley called Coele-Syria. The chief elevation of the eastern range is Mt. Hermon (10,000 ft.). On the western border the Mediterranean forms the continuous margin, maintaining a fairly regular coast line running south-westward, with one conspicuous indentation caused by the seaward thrust of Mt. Carmel at Haifa. On the south there is the indeterminate line dividing the pasture lands from the desert. The traditional boundary is the Wadi el-Arish, the " river of Egypt,[2] which reaches the Mediterranean south of Gaza, and is dry except in the rains. Here the Negeb, the southern desert, begins, stretching away to the east, and embracing all the rocky, arid region to which the various names of Seir, Paran, Horeb and Sinai are indefinitely and inexactly given.[3] On the east, completing the border of the country, there are the highlands of Moab, Gilead and Bashan, or the Hauran, which merge eastward into the Arabian desert and the Druze mountain. The nominal eastern border line is the haj or pilgrim railway which runs from Damascus to Mecca, along a route some twenty to thirty miles east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan.[4] Thus the land is fairly well enclosed by mountains, desert and sea. But these barriers are penetrated in many places by the roads, ancient and modern, which afford ingress and egress.

---

[2] Gen. 15:18.

In Old Testament times it was known as Canaan[5] and its central mountain ridge as the " hill country of the Amorites."[6] In New Testament times the name Syria[7] was used, a rather indefinite term for the entire area between the sea coast and the eastern desert. Generally in the Christian sources the names of the districts are used, the regions into which the country was divided in Roman days — Judea in the south, Samaria in the central section, Galilee in the north, and Perea east of the Jordan. In the Byzantine period the mistaken identification of the Philistines as the dominant inhabitants of the land led to the use of the name Philistia, or Palestia for the country, and from this came the name Palestine, the one which has prevailed in later centuries. Even more common is the title, the " Holy Land," in consideration of the sacredness of the country alike to Jews and Christians.

---

[3] Somewhere in the area south of the Dead Sea the biblical writers located Sinai. The traditional location at Jebel Musa between the gulfs of Suez and Akaba is not earlier than the reign of Justinian and meets none of the biblical conditions (Ex. 3:1; Deut. 33:2; Judg. 5:4, 5). For a picture of the desert road to Egypt, which the ancients described as the " ten terrible stretches of the desert " cf. Isa. 30:6. The Kantara-Haifa railroad runs along this route since the war. The wells, or springs, whose brackish water created oases on this route, are Bir (well) Chenan, B. ed-Jukah, B. en-Nuss, B. Ibraham Basha, B. el-Abd, B. el-Mazar, Nun el-Shanube, Weli esh-Sheikh, Zuwiyid, Tell Rafeh, Wadi el-Arish.

[4] In the days of its greatest extent, such as the reign of Solomon, the Hebrew writers claimed as their land all the territory from " the river," i.e., the Euphrates, to the border of Egypt (1 Kings 4:21).

[5] Gen. 12:5; Ex. 15:15; etc.

[6] Num. 13:29; Deut. 1:44; Josh. 10:6.

[7] Luke 2:2. The name was an error of the Greek geographers for Assyria.

Palestine is marked by an extremely varied topography. There are five areas, running from north to south, with fairly regular characteristics. Along the sea is the Maritime Plain, which is some four miles wide along the ancient Phoenician coast, disappears at the " Ladder of Tyre," where the road runs along the face of the cliff, widens again to four or five miles at Acre, narrows to 200 yards at the foot of Carmel, and then gradually widens until it attains a breadth of 20 miles at Askalon. The southern section of the plain forms the Philistine area, where the five cities of that people once held sway — Gaza, Gath, Ekron, Askalon and Ashdod. Further north lies the Plain of Sharon.

The second division is known as the Shephelah, a broken plateau which forms the ascent to the central mountain range, and through which run many wadis or valleys from the ridge to the plain, most of them dry except in the rainy season. Important among them are the Valley of Aijalon, the route from the coast to Jerusalem in ancient times; the

Wadi Ismain, up which ran the carriage road from Jaffa to Jerusalem; and the Wadi es-Surer, through which runs the Jaffa-Ludd-Jerusalem railroad. Several rivers cross this plain to the sea, among them the Litany (Leontes) near Tyre, the Kishon at Haifa, the Crocodile River, near ancient Caesarea, and the Aujah, near Jaffa.

The third and most conspicuous feature of Palestine is the mountain range, running south from the Lebanons to the Tih desert, and constituting the central backbone of the land. In the north it forms the mountains of Galilee (the "Circle"); in the center it was known as Mt. Ephraim, and in the south as the "hill country of Judea." The elevation at Jerusalem is 2500 feet above the sea, and at Hebron, 20 miles south, 3000 feet. The range is interrupted in only one place — by the triangular plain of Esdraelon in lower Galilee, along whose southern side it is diverted toward the sea, and forms the ridge of Carmel. From the Mediterranean this central range has the appearance of an almost unbroken wall.

The fourth division is the Jordan Valley, a trench deepened through the ages from a geological faulting of the strata, and forming one of the most significant topographical features anywhere to be found. From springs at Banias and Tell el-Kadi at the foot of the Lebanons the Jordan runs as a narrow stream into the swampy Lake Hulah (Merom) whose surface is 7 feet higher than sea level. Twelve miles farther south it enters the Sea of Galilee (Chinnereth, Tiberias), 14 miles long, 6 wide, and 682 feet below sea level. Sixty-six miles farther, with many plunges and windings which lengthen its course to nearly three times this distance, with a fall of 610 feet, it enters the Dead Sea. Here it pours its six million tons of fresh water daily into a basin of water so impregnated with mineral salts that no living creature can exist in it, and so heavy that bathers find it impossible to swim.[8] The water is beautifully clear, and steam and sail boats transport passengers and freight across it. Several streams along the eastern and western shores empty into it, but it has no outlet, the intense heat of the region causing a degree of evaporation which keeps the surface at a measurably uniform level. That level is 1292 feet below the Mediterranean, and the sea is about 1200 feet deep in the deepest part. It is thus apparent that the vertical difference between the altitude of Hebron and the floor of the Dead Sea, less than twenty miles distant, is more than a mile. There is no other chasm of this character on the planet. The mountains of the central range are deeply cut along the western border of the sea and the river, by ravines, which in the early centuries of the Christian era were the resort of hermits who made their abode in niches dug into the faces of the cliffs. The sandy plain north of the sea is curiously marked by mounds and hillocks, the result of erosion by the winter floods.

The Jordan (called by the natives El-Ghor) is on the average about 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep, though there are many fords where crossing is easy on foot or with animals. But in contrast with the Nile or the Euphrates it has little value either for navigation or irrigation. Its total fall of more than 2000 feet renders it unsuitable for boat traffic. It is literally "the plunger," as its name implies. And while its overflow in the rainy season, "the swellings of Jordan,"[9] supports rank vegetation along its banks, it is too far below the level of the land to be of value for irrigation or other purposes without expensive lifting machinery or hydraulic plants like that of the Palestine Electrical Corporation, seven kilometers south of the Sea of Galilee.

---

[8] It has 25% of mineral salts, of which chloride of sodium reaches 7%; potassium chloride, 1%; magnesium bromide, 45%; magnesium chloride, 11%; these proportions increase somewhat with the depth. The total amount of potash is about 2000 million tons; of magnesium bromide, 900 million tons. The salt is of good quality, and a concession has been granted for commercial evaporation, which further yields a valuable concentrate of bromine.

The fifth zone or division of the land is the east-Jordan plateau, a region coveted as pasture land in early days, and later occupied by several important cities in Graeco-Roman times. Various mountain peaks rise to measurable heights in this region, notable among which is Nebo (2843 ft.). Many streams descend to the Jordan and the Dead Sea from this side, chief among which are the Yarmuk (Hieromax) which carries the Haifa-Damascus railroad; the Zerka (Jabbok) about half way between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea; and the Mojib (Arnon) which enters the latter near its middle point. These five strips or zones comprise the historic region of Palestine.[10]

The great plain of Esdraelon[11] is a triangle some fifteen miles on each side, whose points are marked approximately by Jenin, Mt. Tabor, and the outflow of the Kishon to the sea. Mt. Tabor is a symmetrical elevation (1900 ft.) from whose summit a magnificent view is obtained, embracing

---

[9] Jer. 12:5.

[10] The writer of Num. 34:1–15 includes only the west-Jordan territory as proper Hebrew possessions, though he notes that a portion of the clans elected to remain beyond the Jordan. Mukaddasi, an Arab traveler of the middle ages, speaks of four zones of Palestine — the sea coast, the mountain range, the Jordan Valley, and the highlands beyond that border on the desert.

[11] A Greek corruption of Jezreel.

Mt. Hermon, the Sea of Galilee, the mountains of Bashan across the Jordan, Mt. Gilboa, Little Hermon, the hills of Nazareth, the Carmel ridge and the Mediterranean. In the spring the plain itself resembles a huge carpet marked with long regular strips of different shades of green, the unfenced " fields " with their varying crops, separated only by boundary stones. Westward toward Carmel and the sea lies Har Magedon, the site of ancient Megiddo, the highway and battlefield of antiquity, and the apocalyptic scene of the last great battle of history.[12] To the south, near the center of ancient Canaan rise the two peaks of Ebal (3077 ft.) and Gerizim (2849 ft.), the latter the sacred mountain of the Samaritans. Further still to the south, and only three miles north-west of Jerusalem is Nebi Samwil (2935 ft.), once thought to be the site of Mizpah, and revered as the traditional home of Samuel the prophet. It is the Mons Gaudi of the crusaders.

The climate of Palestine varies with the elevation and the season. Small as it is, it has all types from sub-tropical to sub-arctic. At the sea coast the season is that of southern France; on the mountain ridge that of central Germany, with periods of snow in winter; in the lower Jordan Valley the heat is excessive in summer, and here the Herods constructed their winter palaces and bathing pools; in contrast, Mt. Hermon has a crown of snow through much of the year. The average temperature of the country in summer is 75 Fahr., but rises at times to 100 and even above. The heat is usually tempered by cool winds from the sea; but on occasions the Sirocco, a hot wind from the eastern desert, brings discomfort and languor.[13] The average winter temperature is 50, and cold winds often bring it down to the freezing point, with snow. There is usually a dry summer and a rainy winter. The rains begin in November (the "early rain") and continue intermittently until March or April, at which time the "latter rain" ends the wet period. The average rainfall is 28 inches. In the spring the flowers are abundant, and scarlet anemones, yellow and purple mustard, roses of Sharon, poppies and hundreds of other varieties form great splashes of color on the hillsides and in the plains. There are said to be over two thousand varieties of flowers in Palestine. Along the water courses tamarisks, poplars, willows, chrysanthemums and oleanders abound. Oranges, sycamore figs, pomegranates and olives form an important part of the orchard product, and vineyards are a profitable possession. The gardens produce melons, artichokes, and a great variety of vegetables. The common crops are barley, millet, wheat and sesame, and in the region of Jericho cotton, sugar cane, date palms and bananas thrive.

---

[12] 2 Kings 23:29; Rev. 16:16.

The long dry summer turns the richly flowered landscape of spring to an unattractive brown. Water is one of the most precious of gifts. Most of the wadis are dry except in the rains. There are a few springs which afford neighborhood supplies, such as the abundant sources of the Jordan, the Fountain of Mary at Nazareth, the Virgin's Fountain below the east wall of Jerusalem, Elisha's Fountain at Jericho, and a few others. The rainfall was always treasured in cisterns, of which there are a great number in all parts of the land, in every degree of repair and disrepair. Pools for storing water were constructed in various localities, like the so-called Solomon's Pools, probably Herodian, south of Jerusalem, the Pool of the Patriarchs (often miscalled the Pool of Hezekiah) in Jerusalem, and the pool at Hebron, some of which received or supplied their water through aqueducts, of which fragments still remain. There were also hot springs, like those south of Tiberias, and those at Calirrhoë, near the Dead Sea. These were much frequented for medicinal purposes.

---

[13] Jer. 4:11.

In ancient times Palestine must have been rich in forests as well as orchards. The forests have largely disappeared due to the many wars that have desolated the land. The famous cedars of Lebanon are today reduced to two little groves, and under Turkish rule, which exacted tax for every fruit-bearing tree in the orchards and gardens, it was the custom to destroy the trees as soon as the tax increased to prohibitive figure, or the yield of fruit decreased. Since the war some efforts at reforestation have been made, particularly in the south-western section of the country. One is also aware that great damage has been wrought by earthquake. References in the scriptures make this evident.[14] The calamities that befell the country from this cause in recent years [15] are well remembered.

Of the mineral resources of Palestine only moderate statements can be made. The confident words of the Deuteronomist, " a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass " [16] seem much too bold in the light of experience. As already indicated, the Dead Sea contains valuable mineral salts. There are at Jebel Usdum at the southern end of the sea, massive beds of salt in marketable condition. Gypsum is found in several places, particularly in the Ghor south of the Sea of Galilee. Sulphur and alum are also obtainable as secondary products. Petroleum has been found in several localities, particularly at the south end of the Dead Sea, where there is seepage of bitumen and outflow of oil. Phosphates are found in sufficient quantities to serve as a local fertilizer, but not for export. Poor iron ores occur, and traces of copper.

---

[14] Amos 1:1; Zech. 14:5; Matt. 24:7.

[15] In 1837, 1850 and 1927, in which latter year many structures were destroyed in Jerusalem, Jericho, Nablous, etc.

[16] Deut. 8:9.

In considering the limitations of Palestine in size, resources and fertility one is surprised that it should receive such praise from biblical writers, as " a land flowing with milk and honey,"[17] i.e., rich in natural products, and inviting to the stranger. It must be remembered, however, that these descriptive words were not used by people accustomed to the opulent agricultural and mineral lands of Europe and America, but by men from the desert, to whom Palestine seemed a veritable paradise. For generations such clans had swept in across the Jordan to strike roots if they were able, and if not, to plunder and retreat. In contrast with the desert lands around, Palestine was rich and beautiful, and the Old Testament has many references to its attractions.[18] For such a little country and in the thought of people of such desert traditions it was very alluring. It was a country in which flocks and herds could be reared. Sheep, goats, cattle (though of a poor sort), camels, asses, horses and donkeys have been common property in all the centuries. Wild animals, some of them suitable for game, are found. More than five hundred varieties of animals have been listed, three hundred and fifty species of birds, ninety of reptiles, and forty of fishes.

---

[17] Deut. 8:7–9; Num. 13:27; Josh. 5:6.

[18] Cf. Ps. 104; Song of Solomon, passim, etc.

The population of Palestine, while showing a few dominant groups, is today and has always been of the most varied racial stocks. As the great highway from north-east to south-west the country caught and retained fragments of every migration and campaign. As nomads or as villagers they have come from every region, and have represented every tribal strain. More than forty languages are spoken within its borders. As Sir George Adam Smith says, " Palestine has never belonged to any one nation alone, and probably never will."[19] Its ports, though few and difficult, were well known alike to pirates and traders, the sea powers of the levant. Land access was easy through a dozen gateways, and merchants, soldiers, colonists, pilgrims and world travelers have made it a thoroughfare in all ages. Repeatedly its population has been reduced by war, massacre, famine and other tragedies almost to the vanishing point, only to be replenished again in the recovery of the land. In recent years, particularly since the World War, the numbers have grown, due to improved conditions and Zionist enthusiasm. In 1914 the population was recorded as 689,280; in 1922 as 757,182;[20] in 1926 as 852,268 and in 1931 as 1,305,154.

---

[19] *Historical Geography of the Holy Land,* p. 58.

[20] The various groups were listed in 1926: Moslems, 590,890; Jews, 83,790; Christians, 73,024; Druses, 7,028; Samaritans, 165. Besides there were small groups of Hindus, Sikhs, Sudanese, Circassians, Kurds, Persians and Abyssinians. At the present time the census reports a Jewish population of more than 170,000.

Palestine is not a self-supporting land. Through the centuries it has added to its modest income from agriculture a constant revenue from tourists and pilgrims. The sacred places of Christians, Jews and Moslems are here, and large sums are expended by visitors through the usual channels of entertainment, transport and trade, or are contributed to the various shrines by the devout. In addition the Jewish agencies in Europe and America have made generous donations for the support of their indigent brethren in Palestine, and in aid of the Zionist projects such as the purchase of land, the erection of educational and benevolent institutions, and the prosecution of industrial enterprises.

One of the important problems of life in Palestine through the centuries has been that of travel and transportation. Except along the sea-shore and in the plains the roads in ancient times were hardly more than trails followed by camels, asses, horses and human beings. It is difficult to understand how chariots, such as were used by Hebrew, Egyptian, Hittite, Assyrian and Babylonian armies could have traversed the rocky plateaus and mountain ranges. Yet it is clear from the records that such war equipment was used, and this presupposes better roads than survived in later ages.[21] Fragments of Roman roads are found in several places and such highways were the wonder of the world. The main roads were of course the essential commercial and military arteries that connected Palestine with neighboring countries. Of these the principal examples were the "Via Maris," or sea-shore route, running south along the Mediterranean from Asia Minor, through Phoenicia, past the "inscription rocks" at Dog River,[22] and on down the coast to Egypt; a branch of this route northward diverged near Acre or at the pass of Megiddo, and passing Safed, crossed the ancient bridge called by the Arabs Jisr Banat Ya'akoub (the "Bridge of the Daughters of Jacob"), a little south of Lake Hulah, going on over the high foothills of Mt. Hermon to Damascus and the further east; another road started at Hebron or perhaps at Beersheba, and followed the mountain range northward through Jerusalem, Shechem, the great plain, past the Sea of Galilee, and joined the other route near the bridge. Three trade routes ended at Gaza, all passing through Petra, one from Yemen, one from Akaba, and one from Basra and Jauf. Similarly Jaffa, ancient Joppa, was an important gateway, both for land and sea traffic. Kantara on the border of Egypt, Jaffa, Haifa under Mt. Carmel, and Beirut, north of Tyre and Sidon, are the western gates of Palestine, as Jericho and Beisan were those facing east. These are examples of "trunk lines" that reached the important centers, and were intersected by innumerable roads of less significance, by means of which travel and traffic were facilitated. The traveler in Palestine today can see in close proximity the four types of roadway — the ancient camel-caravan routes, still in use; the carriage roads that gave the western world its first easy access to the country; the smooth automobile roads of the present period, over which one is hurried in a three-days rush through the land; and the railroads, which connect Cairo with Jerusalem, Jaffa and Haifa; Haifa with Beisan, the Sea of Galilee and Damascus; and Beirut with Ryak, Damascus, Baalbec and the Baghdad line at Aleppo. The aeroplane provides a fifth and much more rapid means of approach.

---

[21] An Egyptian courier of the thirteenth century B.C. writes of roads in Canaan — "a ravine is on one side of thee, the mountain rises on the other. On thou goest jolting . . . thy chariot on its side." (Gardiner, *Papyrus Anastasi* I p. 26, quoted by J. Garstang, *Foundations of Bible History,* p. 78.) The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago has found that Megiddo was a chariot-city of Solomon with stables for 120 horses.

---

[22] On cliffs at this point a few miles north of Beirut are the records left by Thutmose III, Ramses II, Sennacherib, Cambyses, Alexander, Pompey, Titus, Saladin, Napoleon, Lord Allenby, and many others who led armies along this route and carved the stories of their conquests in this interesting "autograph album" of the ages.

The story of Palestine from its pre-Hebrew days to the present need not be given here. It is sufficient to note the fact that somewhere around the fifteenth century B.C. Hebrew tribes made their way into this land, already occupied by other Semites — Amorites, Canaanites and related groups — and secured a foothold. At this time Canaan was a province of the extensive empire of Egypt, as is shown by the Tell el-Amarna letters. Excavations at Beisan (Beth-Shan) show that Seti I and Ramses II held authority there, and that after Syria was lost to the Hittites, Palestine was still held. The historical materials relating to the country are very meagre outside the Old Testament, which makes it a source of great importance. The Shishak inscription records a fateful moment in the reign of Rehoboam; the Moabite Stone of King Mesha throws interesting light on the period of Ahab and his immediate successors; and the Siloam inscription gives a momentary glimpse into the artisan life of Jerusalem in the days of Hezekiah.

After a rough period of gradual adjustment in the land, in which the culture seems to have been at a low level, monarchy was established under David, and though the kingdom was broken asunder at the close of the reign of his successor, Solomon (937 B.C.), the Hebrew rule continued for more than 200 years with broken dynasties in the northern kingdom of Israel; and for three and a half centuries in the southern kingdom of Judah where the line of David continued to hold the throne. During these periods the land was frequently invaded, and was often under the authority of foreign kings. A succession of subjugations of this character marked the fortunes of the Hebrews. Philistines, Syrians, Assyrians, Babylonians and Persians held sovereignty over the people with brief intervals of independence between, until after repeated tragedies, expatriations and collapses of the national institutions, the Hebrew state completely vanished in the first half of the fifth century B.C.; its people perished or were dispersed, and Hebrew history came to an end.

During these years the fortunes of the land varied with the seasons and the political situation. There were years of plenty and years of drought and famine. There were times of national prosperity under efficient kings, like Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Uzziah and Hezekiah in Jerusalem; and Jeroboam I, Omri, Ahab, and Jeroboam II in Israel, in which their territories were widened and their wealth increased. Then there were days of gloom when through invasion or civil war the people were reduced to narrow margins, as in the bloody " reforms " of Jehu, when the royal family, the nobles and great numbers of the population were massacred in cold blood; or in the straitened times of Jehoahaz when under Syrian pressure the fighting forces of Israel were reduced to " fifty horsemen, ten chariots and ten thousand footmen."[23] The struggles between the advocates of Baalism and the partisans of Jahveh were the causes of much bloodshed and economic loss running through generations. And always there were the dangers from desert raids and the plunderings of armed forces on their way through the land, against which no fortresses or garrisons were wholly effective.

Moral and religious conditions were often in direct contrast with those prevailing in the political and economic realm. The days of greatest prosperity were usually marked by ethical disorders and the decline of loyalty to prophetic standards. Probably for this reason they were the periods in which the great prophets arose. The proverb, "When the tale of bricks is doubled, then comes Moses," seems to have been illustrated in several periods of national prosperity but moral decline in Israel. Over against Jeroboam I there stood Ahijah of Shiloh; Ahab's leanings toward heathenism and idolatry met the reproofs of Elijah; and in the prosperous but worldly era of Jeroboam II came the first of the great writing prophets, Amos and Hosea. The fact that Palestine was a small country, and that the division of the nation at the close of Solomon's reign weakened it disastrously and destroyed forever the possibility of a strong and aggressive state, made inevitable the ultimate downfall of both Israel and Judah at the hands of their stronger neighbors. The final extinction of the Hebrew nation was a foregone conclusion, considering its exposed position, its inherent weakness, its lack of competent leadership, and the constant mistakes into which its kings and counselors were betrayed. Its heritage passed to the world through the survival of its prophetic, priestly, philosophic and devotional literature, and the transmission of its spiritual message to men of kindred mind but of many races and distant lands. Into the keeping of its daughter faiths, especially Judaism and Christianity, the rich dower of Hebrew thought and life was passed. The Hebrews failed as a nation, but as the interpreters of ethical monotheism, the spiritual monitors of humanity, "their line has gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."

---

[23] 2 Kings, chapts. 9, 10; 13:7.

The traditions of Hebrew monarchy, under which the kingdoms of Israel and Judah had been organized, were gone, and a new national group, the Jews, came into being. The government passed into the hands of a priesthood, which claimed descent from the Levitical clans of the past. The synagogue became the center of the common worship. Jewish parties and professions like the Pharisees, scribes, Sadducees and Essenes took form, and a council called the Sanhedrin administered a measure of control.

With the rise of Judaism under Nehemiah and Ezra a new day dawned for Palestine. Although the Jewish colony was at first confined to the narrow limits of the former kingdom of Judah, from which it derived its name, its influence gradually spread to the adjacent regions. After years of struggle against unfavorable circumstances, Judaism was apparently saved from absorption into the Hellenism of the second century B.C. by the Maccabean uprising in defense of the Torah and the priestly rites of the sanctuary. This was the most heroic period in its history and furnished the little state with a line of rulers, the Maccabees, who gave it a brief period of independence, and continued in power until the arrival of Pompey, the conquest of the land by Rome, and the rise of the Roman protégés, the Edomite Herods. During the Maccabean period the Jewish state was greatly enlarged. Neighboring regions were conquered and their citizens converted to Judaism, either by persuasive or forcible means. Missionaries carried out the message of Judaism into other portions of the empire, so that members of the diaspora (Jews living in the "dispersion") were found in all lands.

The Jewish population of Palestine grew rapidly. It overreached the limited confines of Judea and occupied the northern region of Galilee. Josephus affirms that in his day, the first century A.D., there were 240 towns in Galilee, and 40 walled cities, with a total population of more than three millions.[24] There was also a large Jewish population in Perea, east of the Jordan, in the Greek cities like Gerasa, Philadelphia, etc., and in many towns and villages. The central part of western Palestine was occupied by the Samaritans, who had increased in numbers and dominated the province of Samaria with its metropolis at Neapolis (Nablous), although the Herodian city of Samaria (Sebaste) a few miles distant, of which Caesarea was the seaport, was second only to Jerusalem in the beauty of its architecture and the elaborate scale on which its affairs were projected as a Herodian residence. With this semi-Roman ostentation the Samaritans of the province had little to do. The old rivalry between them and the Jews continued as the New Testament proves, and Jewish travelers in going from Judea to Galilee avoided contact with the disesteemed Samaritans by crossing the Jordan and traveling through Perea.[25] The rivalry between the temple in Jerusalem, the one public structure that survived the collapse of the southern kingdom, and the Samaritan sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim came to its issue in the destruction of the latter by John Hyrcanus in 128 B.C.; and in place of the older sanctuary of Zerubbabel in Jerusalem, Herod the Great erected the gorgeous temple which in Jesus' day was the pride of the Jews in spite of their detestation of its builder. This was the most brilliant period in the political history of Judaism, and all the more significant as it preceded by so short an interval the outbreak of the Jewish war against Rome, the tragic and murderous siege of Jerusalem by Titus, the slaughter of its people and of vast numbers of Jews who had come to Jerusalem to attend the Passover, the downfall and complete destruction of the city, and the end of the Jewish state (70 A.D.). Thus for a period of five centuries (445 B.C.–70 A.D.) the Jews were in possession, first of Judea, and later of the rest of Palestine east and west of the Jordan with the exception of Samaria.

---

[24] The statements of this author are taken with some allowance by scholars.

The rise of Christianity had little if any influence on the political or social life of Palestine. From the point of view of the administration, either the local Jewish council in Jerusalem or the Roman control of the land, the Christians, or Nazarenes as they were called, were but a small group within the Jewish community, and it was only in later years that the movement became important in the affairs of the country.

---

[25] The fact that Jesus chose to go through Samaria on one of his journeys occasioned comment by the writer of the Fourth Gospel (John 4:3).

The Roman era in Palestine wrought a complete change in all aspects of its life. The door was first opened to this western control when Judas Maccabaeus in a moment of desperation sent an embassy to Rome asking assistance against the forces of Syria (164 B.C.). This was successful, but it established the tradition of Roman authority which led to the final absorption of Palestine into the empire, and ultimately to the destruction of Jerusalem. From the arrival of Pompey, who annexed Syria in 66 B.C. and conquered Jerusalem in 63, to the time of Hadrian and the second Roman war, the country was completely under Roman control, and every effort at independence met with drastic repression. The province of Palestine during this period included the territory from Caesarea to Rafa, the ancient Raphia on the coast, and as far east as Gerasa (Jerash). Roman roadways were constructed, fragments of which are still to be found along the Via Maris, on the way from Jerusalem to Nablous, near Tell Sandahannah in the southwest, and near the upper Jordan, where a Roman bridge still stands.[26] Other Roman remains such as mosaic floors have been found at Beit Jibrin, near Samakh on the Sea of Galilee, at Kulomeh, west of Jerusalem, where the tenth legion was quartered, and in a number of other places.

The Herods who held a titular rule under Roman patronage were a race of builders, whose work bore the Roman stamp. Herod the Great not only erected the third temple in Jerusalem, but built the three towers on the western hill, Mariamne, named for his wife, Phasaelus, for his brother, and Hippicus, for a friend. The so-called tower of David, near the Jaffa Gate, is a survival of this enterprise. Many other architectural achievements at Sebaste, Caesarea, Antioch, Banias and in other places, were proofs of his genius, liberality or extravagance. A fortress on the summit of the Frank Mountain south of Jerusalem, and a palace in the town at its foot were his gifts to the place which was later the site of his sepulchre. The " Pools of Solomon " south of Jerusalem are thought to be Herodian. Herod Antipas, his son, erected such structures as the palaces at Tiberias and Machaerus, and another son, Philip, who ruled a small territory east of Galilee enlarged the building operations of his father at Banias, where one of the sources of the Jordan issues from its cave, and named the place Caesarea Philippi in honor of the emperor and himself. Another member of the family, Herod Agrippa, a grandson of Herod the Great, appointed by Claudius king of Judea, added to the fortifications of Jerusalem. The Roman procurators, seven in number, who held the actual authority in Palestine, added some features to the public works. Pilate's name is connected by tradition with the construction of the sealed spring that supplied the " Pools of Solomon."

---

[26] The Romans were the master road-builders, and their work remains in many parts of the world from Britain to India. The title of the emperors was Pontifex Maximus, " chief bridge-builder," a designation that was later assumed by the popes.

Meantime the resentment of the Jews against Roman administration increased during the years in which the Herods and the procurators were in control. Through the governorships of Cumanus, Felix, Festus, Albanus and Gessius Florus (48–66 A.D.) the turmoil grew in violence. Cestius Gallus proconsul of Syria was defeated by a Jewish force, and Vespasian the ablest general at Nero's command was sent to Palestine. His son Titus completed the subjugation of the country and the destruction of Jerusalem. But even these drastic measures did not wholly crush the Jewish spirit. Agitation was still continued, and in 116 A.D. in the reign of Hadrian occurred a fresh uprising of Jews in the empire. This was suppressed with fresh cruelties, and on the site of the revered Jerusalem, the holy city of so many generations, Hadrian erected a Roman city which he named Aelia Capitolina, in which a temple to Jupiter occupied the place where the temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel and Herod had stood, and near it on the east where the Dome of the Chain now stands, he placed an equestrian statue of himself. This outrage against the sentiments of the Jews was the cause of a fresh and furious revolt under Simon bar-Cochba (" son of the star ") in 132–135 A.D. This rebellion was crushed by Rome, the final stand of the Jews being made at Bether (Bittir) a station today on the Jaffa line, south-west of Jerusalem. The edict of Titus expelling Jews from Palestine was now made increasingly stringent, with resulting hardships endured by this unhappy people.

It was evident that Rome was not to be left undisturbed in possession of Palestine. Already in 51 B.C. and again in 40 the Parthians invaded Syria under Procorus, took Antioch and Sidon, and plundered Jerusalem. Their serious object however was to place Antigonus, one of the Maccabean claimants, upon the throne. Failing in this, they withdrew. This was but one of several invasions and attacks from outside peoples during the centuries when Rome controlled Palestine.

The conversion of the emperor Constantine to Christianity in 324 A.D. caused the change of the official religion of the empire from paganism to the new faith, and his mother Helena made a pilgrimage to Palestine where she was able according to the belief of the time to discover the site of Calvary, the true cross, and other sacred localities and relics. A church was erected on the supposed site of the holy sepulchre, and sanctuaries at Bethlehem, Nazareth and other sacred spots were built.

In 361 A.D. the emperor Julian, called by the Christians "the apostate," because of his reversion to paganism, rescinded the edicts against the Jews, and gave orders for the restoration of the temple at Jerusalem. However he did not live to see this project realized.

In 395 A.D. the Roman empire was divided into the eastern and western sections, and Palestine passed into the possession of the Greek half, of which the capital was at Constantinople. A few years later, in 451, Jerusalem was made the seat of a patriarch. The Madeba mosaic map, in a Greek church of this period east of the Jordan, represents Jerusalem as an important city, inclosed with walls, and shows the location and form of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The reign of the emperor Justinian (527–565 A.D.) brought fresh architectural enrichment to Palestine. One of the most important Christian structures erected by him was a church in Jerusalem in honor of the Virgin Mary, built (534 A.D.) on the southern end of the temple area. This structure was converted into a mosque called Al

Aksa[27] by the caliph Omar in 637. Justinian also built the Golden Gate on the east side of the temple platform.

In 614 A.D. the Persians under Chosroes II (Khosru) invaded Palestine, plundered Jerusalem and massacred most of the inhabitants. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre was burned, and many other structures were ruined. Historians affirm that the Jews took an active part with the Persians in this attack upon the city. The emperor Heraclius recovered the territory for the empire in 629 A.D. and celebrated his victory over Chosroes by entering Jerusalem through the Golden Gate. At this time the Jews living there were slain in reprisal.

The next event of moment was the Moslem conquest of Palestine, a part of one of the most remarkable political and religious revolutions in history. Mohammed was born at Mecca in 570 A.D. Twenty-five years after his death in 632 A.D. his Arabs were in control of Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Babylonia and Persia. A half century later all northern Africa and most of Spain confessed the faith of Islam, and its forces were pushing into southern France. In a century from the birth of the Prophet the call to prayer was heard from the minarets of ten thousand mosques. The desert had invaded the sown; the tent had conquered the castle.

There had been Arab immigrations into Palestine before the Moslem conquest, but with the coming of the armies of the Prophet this movement was greatly increased, and new elements were rapidly added to the Christian, Jewish and Samaritan population. In 634 A.D. the forces of Heraclius, the Greek emperor, were defeated by the Arab leader Abu Bekr, and in 637 Khaled ibn il-Walid, another Moslem chieftain, defeated the Greeks at the Yarmuk, and the Byzantine empire in Syria fell. The caliph Omar took Jerusalem after a brief siege, but treated its people with kindness. He changed its name to Beit el-Makdis (" the holy house ") or El-Kuds (" the holy "), by which name the Arabs know it today. Thus three hundred years from the erection of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre by Constantine, the Moslems conquered the country which they continued to hold, with brief intervals during crusader times, until Lord Allenby's entry in 1917. The land has therefore been in Moslem possession for a little less than thirteen hundred years.

---

[27] "The distant," i.e. from Mecca. It was reconverted into a church by the knights of St. John during the crusades.

At the time at which Jerusalem fell to Omar, the seat of the caliphate was transferred from Mecca to Damascus. With reverence for the traditions of Jerusalem, particularly those which connected the Prophet with the place, Omar cleared the site of the ancient temples of accumulated debris, and built there a temporary mosque. This was never called the Mosque of Omar. The real Mosque of Omar is just outside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, on the supposed site of the caliph's prayer of gratitude when he took the city in 637 A.D. Tradition affirms that he refused to enter the church, lest that fact should make it a mosque.[28] It should be remembered to the credit of Islam that these shrines particularly sacred to the Christians were not converted into mosques, although this change took place in most cases, such as Santa Sophia at Constantinople, the Church of St. John in Damascus, etc. In 684 a Dome of the Rock was built to cover the holy stone, on which it was believed Abraham offered his son and later the altar of burnt offerings stood. Many Moslem legends connected this rock with the alleged night visit of the Prophet to Jerusalem. In 691 A.D. the Omayyed caliph Abd el-Melek in Damascus, desiring a pilgrimage site to offset those at Mecca and Medina, which were in the possession of his rival caliph Abdullah, erected the beautiful "Dome of the Rock," which stands to this day as one of the triumphs of Moslem art.[29]

---

[28] There is also a small Mosque of Omar in one of the aisles of the Mosque al-Aksa.

In 750 the caliphate was transferred from Damascus to Baghdad, where a half century later the caliph Haroun er-Rashid of the Abbassid dynasty in his correspondence with the emperor Charlemagne gave his permission for the rebuilding of the ravaged Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and other sacred buildings in Jerusalem.

Nothing illustrates more forcibly the varied fortunes and misfortunes of Jerusalem and Palestine as a whole than the fact that in 930 A.D. the Carmathians sacked Mecca, overran Palestine, and destroyed the chief structures of Jerusalem, including the Holy Sepulchre. Hardly had the city recovered from this visitation when Ikhshid, the Turkish governor in Egypt and Syria, led a force against Jerusalem, massacred the Christians there, and burned the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, just rising from its ashes. This was in 934 A.D. Two years later the Fatimite partisans in Cairo declared their independence of the caliph, and brought Palestine again under Egyptian control. This authority continued until 1012 when the mad Hakim, Amr Allah, the founder of the Druse sect, instituted a campaign of persecution against the Christians and their holy places, in which Jerusalem again suffered partial destruction.

---

[29] The name "Mosque of Omar" is often applied to this building, but without warrant. It has none of the properties of a mosque.

During these years of Moslem dominance, the capital was at Ramlah, not at Jerusalem. Meantime pilgrims both Jewish and Christian made their way from Europe to the sacred places of their religions, often suffering great hardships and sometimes death at the hands of pagans and Moslems. The anchorites who made their homes in the wadis of the Jordan and the Dead Sea likewise suffered persecution and even martyrdom. Travelers told of outrages perpetrated on pilgrims and hermits. In 796 A.D. the monks at Mar Saba fell victims to the number of hundreds to the savagery of the Bedouins. In these years the Seljukian Turks, a race of Mongol origin but gradually converted to the Moslem faith, were pushing to the west. In 1077 A.D. these fierce tribesmen took Jerusalem and pillaged it. It seemed as if the whole eastern world were turning to the crescent and the fortunes of the cross were at stake. The conversion and westward thrust of the Turks had brought a revival to Islam. Europe was believed to be in danger from these aggressions. The Holy Land was in the hands of the infidel. Spain had yielded to Moorish conquest. Sicily was a Moslem land. The holy places were in reproach. The sepulchre of Jesus was scorned. The penitents who sought to atone for their sins by the pilgrimage were subjected to ill usage, and compelled to pay heavy tolls as the price of their journey. Many of them lost their lives.

The stories of these events stirred the souls of many in Christian Europe. As early as 1064 a company had gone out from Germany to rescue the Holy Land. The Roman church was besought by the Greek emperor at Constantinople to take action in the crisis. There were many motives that might well prompt the pope to this course. Among them were the desire to recover the lost areas of the east to the church; the possibility of turning multitudes to the faith of Jesus; and the offering of a worthy cause to the manhood of Europe, to arouse it from its lethargy and its vices. The result of all these complex interests of the time was the crusades, that series of romantic, chivalric, militant, political, religious, sublime, selfish, tragic and futile enterprises which kept Europe in a fever of excitement for two centuries, drained away half its wealth and a great portion of its strength, and left behind, along with some advantages, a trail of hatreds, international misunderstandings and worldliness from which another two centuries were required for its recovery.

Pope Urban II preached a sermon at Clermont in the south of France in 1095 which sounded the summons to the First Crusade. The response was instant and widespread. The stories and preaching of Peter of Amiens, known as Peter the Hermit, deepened the enthusiasm. Strips of cloth in the form of the cross were sewn on the garments of those who enlisted. " It is the will of God " (*Deus vult*) was the watchword of the hour. Men, women and children of every class joined the movement, and started eastward under many kinds of leadership. Strangely enough the first attacks were made not upon the Moslems of Palestine but upon the Jews of Europe. In cities along the Rhine at least ten thousand of these unfortunate people were massacred. Thousands of these crusaders pushed on through eastern Europe under leaders like Peter and Walter the Penniless, pillaging and plundering as they went, with no adequate leadership or organization. Their ranks were thinned by sickness, starvation and the attacks of the exasperated peoples through whose lands they passed, and hardly a skeleton of the body that left the west reached Constantinople.

A more orderly force followed. These were the men-at-arms who were recruited by such leaders as Godfrey de Bouillon, Baldwin his brother, Tancred, Duke Robert of Normandy, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Bohemond and Stephen of Blois. This body reached Constantinople where they found the remnants of the earlier advance. To the cultured Greeks of the Byzantine capital these crusaders from the west seemed barbarians in their manners and culture, and they were glad to be rid of them. They aided them with guides and gold. After victories at Nicea and Dorylеum, the crusaders reached Jerusalem in 1099, and took the city by assault after a brief siege. There was a terrible massacre of the citizens, ten thousand of whom are said to have been slaughtered on the temple area. The mosques were transformed into churches. The Dome of the Rock was consecrated as a church, with the name of the "Temple of the Lord," and a guard was appointed for it from among Godfrey's knights, who from this assignment assumed the designation of Knights Templar. By this time it was apparent that most of the leaders were more concerned to secure for themselves sections of the east than to rescue the Holy Sepulchre. Baldwin had designs on Edessa, which were later realized. Tancred and Bohemond were rivals for the possession of Antioch. Raymond of Toulouse coveted Tripoli. The rivalries of these and other leaders did much to limit the glory and the success of the adventure.

Jerusalem was made the capital of a Latin kingdom, and Godfrey, refusing the title of king, was elected "Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre." It was unfortunate that this most knightly of the crusader chieftains lived but a few months; but he did much in the meantime to organize the kingdom which endured for 88 years, and to provide it with suitable laws. He died in 1100 A.D. and his body was buried in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. His sword is still displayed in the Latin sacristy there. His brother Baldwin was brought from Edessa to be his successor, and was crowned as the first king of Jerusalem in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem on Christmas Day, 1101.[30] There followed a period of comparative peace. The Moslems were divided by sect rivalries. The borders of the Latin kingdom were extended until it reached from Beirut on the north to Wadi Arish on the south, and eastward beyond the Jordan. The various chiefs were engaged principally in strengthening their own territorial holdings, and erecting their castles.

---

[30] The kings of Jerusalem were chosen from the family of Baldwin, either through direct descent, or through inheritance by marriage, the widow of a king conveying the crown to a second husband or to her children. A partial list is as follows: Baldwin I, brother of Godfrey (1101–1118); Baldwin II, de Burgh, nephew (1118–1131); Fulke of Anjou, husband of a daughter of Baldwin II (1131–1143); Baldwin III, son (1143–1162); Amalric I, brother (1162–1174); Baldwin IV, son (1174–1185); Baldwin V, grandson of Baldwin III (1186); Guy de Lusignan, husband of Sibylla, daughter of Baldwin III (1186–1192); Conrad of Montferrat, son-in-law of Amalric I (1192); Henry of Champagne, son-in-law of Amalric I (1192–1197); Amalric II, brother of Guy de Lusignan, king of Jerusalem and Cyprus (1197–1205); etc.

The two orders of chivalry attained large areas and great wealth. The knights of the Hospital arose as promoters of the hospice service established as early as 800 A.D. by the emperor Charlemagne, and enlarged by the merchants of Amalfi in Italy, who in 1030 built their hospice for pilgrims and the sick in the Muristan, near the Sepulchre. When Jerusalem was taken by the crusaders in 1099 the order of Knights Hospitallars, or Knights of St. John (the Baptist) was founded, and grew into great importance during the following years.[31] They wore the white cross. The Templars, founded in 1118, whose symbol was the red cross, likewise grew into a powerful order, with castles and other properties.[32] The two orders the Templars and the Hospitallars were the chief commercial as well as military bodies in Palestine. They carried on extensive banking enterprises with the cities of Europe, and secured from the kings large concessions in the form of remitted taxes, trading quarters and other advantages. They controlled the caravan routes, and collected toll from passing merchants. The crusades were not merely a series of military expeditions that can be numbered and arranged in order.[33] During all the days of the Latin kingdom and even more in later years, immigration from Europe was constant. Fleets from Venice, Genoa, and other Italian ports brought not only pilgrims and crusaders, but provisions as well. The Frank or western population of Palestine increased constantly, and became a recognized element in the land.

---

[31] When the crusaders were finally driven from Palestine in 1291 they occupied Rhodes and later, in 1530, Malta, from which latter fact the Knights of Malta derived their name.

[32] The crusading castles were among the most remarkable structures ever erected in Palestine, both in number and strength. Some of them were private strongholds, the residence of a local lord, but most of them were built as fortresses for the protection of the kingdom, and as headquarters of the three great orders, the Templars, the Hospitallars and the Teutonic Knights, organized in 1190. Among them may be mentioned the castle of Raymond of St. Gilles, Count of Tripoli, later called by the Arabs Sinjil; the castle of Baldwin, called by the natives Bardawil; Belfort, a Templar stronghold on a spur of the Lebanons, 1500 feet above the Litany, whose ruins are still impressive. In a siege of the place Reginald of Sidon, Lord of Belfort, was captured and bound on a cross outside the walls, from which to the astonishment of the besiegers he exhorted his men inside the castle not to surrender. Other notable castles of crusading days were Belvoir, Mirabel, Blanche Garde (Tell es-Safi, Gath), Mont Gisart (on the site of ancient Gezer), Chastel Rouge, near Nebi Musa, Kerek of the Desert, east of the Dead Sea, Mont Real, south of the Dead Sea, Gibalin (Beit Jibrin), Belmont (Suba), Ibalin (Jamnia), Chateau Pelerin (Athlit), Montfort, belonging to the Teutonic order, besides castles at Tiberias, Safed, Banias, Bethulia, Ahamant, above Wadi Musa, and Jebail (Byblos). The two most impressive present-day survivals from crusading times are Marghab ("the Watcher") near Homs, and the Krak des Chevaliers above Tripoli, both strongholds of the Hospitallars.

The Second Crusade was launched in 1146. It was the result of the fall of Edessa which was taken by the Turks under Zengi two years before. It was proclaimed under papal authority by the powerful preacher, St. Bernard of Clairveaux, and was undertaken by Conrad III of Germany and Louis VII of France. An unsuccessful attack was made on Damascus, and the campaign collapsed in 1148. And now appeared the most significant figure of the crusades, the Moslem chief who closed the first chapter of the war with the tragedy of Hattin, and ushered in the second. The Moslems, who had been divided and ineffective in the days of Godfrey and the first Baldwins, were now united under

[33] In addition to the eight crusades usually enumerated there were many others of less importance, such as that of the Venetians in 1123–4; Henry the Lion, 1172; Simon de Montfort, the Albigensian Crusade, 1208, one of the most discreditable chapters in history; Edward I of England, 1271–2; the Shepherds Crusade; the Baltic Crusade, and others. In fact there was hardly a year in which some expedition did not go out in some direction, with a crusading purpose.

the famous leader Saladin (Salah ed-Din). When he was born in 1137 the Franks, as the crusaders were called, held Antioch, Edessa, Tripoli, Sidon, Tyre, Acre and Jerusalem. There was a fairly friendly feeling between the two groups, the result of years of comparative peace. Saladin by his abilities secured the control of Syria, the former domain of Nur ed-Din, the son of Zengi, in 1174, with its capital at Damascus; and of Egypt, where he first made himself vizier in 1169 and caliph in 1171. He was thus able to unite the forces of Islam in the entire near east. He established his gorgeous court at Damascus, and from that center prepared to drive the Christian invaders from the land.

He was defeated by the Christian forces under Baldwin at Ramlah in 1177, but in the following year gained a victory over them near Banias. A truce was concluded for two years, which was carefully observed by Saladin, but more than once violated by the crusaders. Meantime the Latin kingdom increasingly suffered under weak and inefficient rulers. Baldwin IV was a boy and a leper. He died in 1185. His little nephew, Baldwin V, died in the following year. Guy de Lusignan, the second husband of Sibylla, daughter of Amalric I, was an outsider and was cordially disliked and distrusted by the other chiefs. It was easy to discern the rising tide of danger around the kingdom. Appeals for help were sent to Europe by the patriarch of Jerusalem and the grand masters of the crusading orders. It was none too soon. Saladin, aroused by breaches of the truce, proclaimed the " Jihad," the holy war, and with a spirit as vigorous as that which animated the first crusaders, the Turks began operations. A force of Templars and Hospitallars was defeated and destroyed near Tiberias, and on July 4, 1187, the army of king Guy, 20,000 in number, was surrounded at the Horns of Hattin and practically annihilated. Count Raymond of Tripoli cut his way through to Tyre. The king was held prisoner. Saladin executed the master of the Templars and many others. This defeat broke the Christian power in Palestine. The conquest of Jerusalem followed in September after a two-week siege. None of the cruelties committed by the army of Godfrey on the citizens of Jerusalem were permitted by Saladin. He treated his captives with great magnanimity, even paying the ransoms of many who were too poor to purchase their own liberty. The Latin kingdom was now at an end after eighty-eight years. Of all the places taken by the crusaders only Tyre, Tripoli and Marghab were left.

The news of this disaster shocked all Europe and aroused a fresh sense of responsibility for the Sepulchre of the Lord. The result was the projection of the Third Crusade. Conrad of Montferrat led out a body of crusaders who arrived at Tyre three weeks after the battle of Hattin, and saved that city. His earnest appeals were heard in Germany, France and England. Philip Augustus of France, Henry II of England, and Frederick I, Barbarossa, of Germany took the vow to go to the aid of the distressed Christians in the Holy Land. A tax called " Saladin's tithe " was laid on the territories of the church of Rome. Frederick lost his life near Tarsus. Richard I, Coeur de Lion, who took the place of his father Henry, after wintering in Sicily and Cyprus, reached Acre, where Philip Augustus had already arrived. After much disputation and misunderstanding between the crusading forces, Acre was taken in 1191, and its fall was attended with incredible cruelties, in which the worst qualities of Richard's erratic and ferocious nature were exhibited. Philip returned to France, but Richard remained in Palestine, fighting with astonishing courage at Arsuf and Jaffa. In negotiations with Saladin, Richard demanded the surrender of Jerusalem but this was refused.[34] Richard led his army as far as Nebi Samwil, from which Jerusalem could be seen, and then to the astonishment of all, returned to the coast.[35] He concluded a truce of three years with Saladin, and sailed on his unhappy journey for England, only to meet misfortune, arrest and imprisonment on the way. The Third Crusade (1189–1193) had thus failed in all its objectives, and had only added a sinister chapter to crusading history.[36] Saladin died in the same year that saw the close of this crusade, and is buried in a beautiful marble tomb near the great mosque, once the church of St. John, in Damascus.

The remaining years of crusading effort were marked by both wisdom and folly, piety and crime, success and failure, enthusiasm and despair.[37] The final scenes were

[34] Saladin's reply was, "Jerusalem belongs to us as much as to you, and is more precious in our eyes than in yours, for it was the place of our Prophet's journey, and the place where the angels gathered. Therefore do not imagine that we shall give the city up to you, or that we shall suffer ourselves to be persuaded in the matter. As regards the land, it belonged originally to us, and you came to attack us." (Rosebault, *Saladin,* p. 281.)

[35] The height was called by the crusaders "Mons Gaudi" ("the mountain of joy") as the point from which the first view of the city was obtained. Richard was reported to have fallen on his knees and cried, "Oh Lord God, I pray that I may never see thy holy city if so be that I may not rescue it from the hand of thy enemies."

[36] Richard sold Cyprus to Guy de Lusignan, and the city of Famagusta became a retreat for Knights Templars who were forced out of Palestine, and the seat of the Lusignan kings for several generations.

[37] The Fourth Crusade (1198–1204) was completely diverted from its

the hopeless contests of the Christian forces with the redoubtable Baibars, the Mamaluke sultan of Egypt, the sternest and most fanatical of all the Moslem leaders. He swore that he would sweep all the invaders from the land. A raid of the Kharasmians, fierce Tatars from east of the Caspian, who invaded Palestine in 1244 slaughtering Christians and Moslems alike, compelled these two to unite for once in common defense.[38] In the battle of Gaza the invaders were defeated, but the Christian knights died almost to a man, and their cause in the land was given its death blow. Baibars had determined to destroy all the crusader castles, and this he proceeded to do. One after another they were demolished or dismantled — Caesarea, Arsuf, Safed, Jaffa, Belfort, Antioch, Krak des Chevaliers, Montfort. The only fortresses left were Marghab, Tortosa, Sidon, Tyre, Athlit and Acre, and these were gradually given up until only Acre was left, a forlorn rallying point for the surviving

---

purpose, and turned by the clever Henry Dandolo, doge of Venice, into a commercial campaign against Constantinople. The so-called "Children's Crusade" (1212–1213) was a pitiful adventure, in which an army of youths was delivered by fanatics and scoundrels to the slave markets of the levant. The Fifth Crusade was promoted by pope Innocent III, but succeeded only in taking Damietta in Egypt. The Sixth (1227–1240) was really a contest between pope Gregory IX and the emperor Frederick II, who was placed under ban, but actually reached Palestine, and through clever diplomacy was made king of Jerusalem. The Seventh was sponsored by pope Innocent IV, and was chiefly a fruitless campaign of St. Louis of France in Egypt, whose losses and horrors were relieved in a measure by the presence and kindly ministries of St. Francis of Assisi. He is even said to have visited the Moslem camp and preached before Malek-Kamel, son of Saladin, and sultan of Cairo. This is the theme of Giotto's frescoes in Santa Croce at Florence, "Francis before the Soldan." The Eighth and last of the crusades was a futile expedition of St. Louis against Tunis, where this devoted but unwarlike monarch died in 1270.

[38] The Kharasmians plundered Jerusalem, scattered the bones of Godfrey and Baldwin, who had been buried in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and burned the church.

warriors from the west. The fall of Acre came in 1291, and the last of the crusaders departed from Palestine, to find haven in Cyprus, in Rhodes, in Malta, or in Europe.

But they left behind them the memorials of their disastrous adventure. The ruins of their castles were everywhere to be seen, and some few were left fairly intact. Many of their churches remained, wholly or in part — at Nazareth, Samaria (where they believed John the Baptist was buried), Bireh, Bethlehem, Ramlah, Hebron, Tabor, Tyre (where Frederick Barbarossa was interred) and Jerusalem. Other remains of their occupation are found in Acre, Caesarea, Bethany, etc. But there were many other reminders of the two centuries of warfare. An entire population had moved from Europe into the land, intermarried with the native people, and had no desire to leave. Those who returned carried with them the inevitable consequences of their experience — the moral and physical disintegration of war and camp life, the diseases which afflicted Europe for generations, and the hatreds against Jew and Moslem which have never been wholly effaced.

There were commercial advantages and losses. Trade was promoted between the east and west, and maritime adventure was stimulated. Many of the commodities of the levant were introduced into Europe — rhubarb, sugar, rice, artichokes, lemons. Many Arabic words came into western vocabularies — admiral, alcohol, alfalfa, alkali, algebra, azimuth, etc. The masonic and fraternal bodies of modern times grew out of the crusading orders. Medicine, navigation, architecture and many forms of literary activity were promoted. Relics of many sorts were brought back from the east, especially the bones of saints.[39] Honors were showered upon the men who returned victorious from Palestine. But most who went out never returned, and many of those who did became outlaws, adventurers or mendicants, a liability to the regions they infested. The Roman church and the crusading orders profited extensively from the holy wars,[40] but civilization, in spite of some advantageous by-products from the adventure, was set back a century or more.

The story of Palestine since can be put in brief form. Nothing comparable to the Moslem conquest of the seventh century and the crusades of the eleventh to the thirteenth occurred until the days of the World War and the deliverance of the land from Turkish control.

In 1402 Tamerlane, the earth-shaking Mongol, laid Palestine waste in the course of his campaign against the sultan Bajazed, who was defeated and made prisoner at the battle of Angora. In 1516 the Ottoman Turks under sultan Selim conquered the Mamaluke rulers of the country, and a year later became masters of Egypt as well. Selim was followed by his son, Suleman the Magnificent, whose long and prosperous rule (1520–1566) was an era of culture and expansion. He pushed the boundaries of the Turkish empire far into Europe. He rebuilt the wall of Jerusalem in 1542, the latest of many of its fortifications, and repaired the Dome of the Rock.

---

[39] The passion to possess relics as the peculiar treasure of western churches led to almost unbelievable acts of vandalism. Particularly was this the case at the sack of Constantinople in the Fourth Crusade. Such relics as the skulls and other bones of holy men, particularly apostles, the cup called the Holy Grail, the sacred lance, and innumerable fragments of the true cross, were the objects of whole bodies of tradition developed in the various centers of Christendom. The house of the Virgin was believed to have been miraculously transported from Nazareth to Loretto to preserve it from desecration at the hands of Moslems. The sword with which Peter cut off the ear of the servant in Gethsemane is treasured in the cathedral at Palermo — and the ear with it! One church boasts of a vial containing some of the darkness of the seventh plague of Egypt! The age of the crusades was fertile soil for such legends. St. George, the Christian knight, whose exploits were a tradition of the age, became the patron saint of England, Portugal and Aragon.

[40] The church in gifts of land, the mortgaging of estates to secure funds for equipment, in money raised as contributions for the crusades, and in the sale of exemptions from crusade duties; the orders, particularly the Templars, by such increase of wealth and power as made them formidable rivals of the governments of Europe, and led at last to their suppression.

The next event of world interest was the invasion of Palestine by Napoleon, who dreamed of a great empire in Asia, and having won a victory over the Mamalukes at the battle of the Pyramids in Egypt, pushed on into Syria. He made his headquarters at Ramlah, took Jaffa in 1799, and massacred 4000 prisoners, but lost a large portion of his army by the plague, and was compelled by the combined British and Turkish forces to abandon his project.

Early in the nineteenth century there was a movement of Druses from the Lebanon region to the Mt. Carmel district, but later most of them departed to the Hauran and the Druze mountain, although some villages remain on Mt. Carmel.

In 1831 Mohammad Ali, Turkish governor of Egypt, freeing himself from the authority of the sultan at Constantinople, conquered Palestine, which thus again came under the dominion of Egypt. Later the peasantry of the country revolted and Jerusalem was taken, but Ibrahim Pasha, son of Mohammad Ali, regained Palestine and Syria and held them for several years until driven out by the combined forces of Great Britain and Austria. In 1841 the European powers restored Palestine to Turkey, and it continued under this regime until the World War. In 1851, the question of the guardianship of the holy places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem was the subject of rivalry between France and Russia, and this reached a degree of bitterness which led to the Crimean War in 1853. In 1891 the emperor William II of Germany visited Jerusalem and a section of the city wall adjacent to the Jaffa Gate was removed in his honor and for his entry into the city. In the following year the Jaffa-Jerusalem railroad, the first of the Palestinian railways, was put in operation, largely as a German enterprise.

Due to the friendly relations between Germany and Turkey, and the number of commercial projects undertaken by Germans in Palestine and the near east, notably the Baghdad railway, Turkey entered the World War on the side of the central powers, and its military and naval forces were placed under German direction. This fact involved Palestine, and one of the most significant engineering projects of the war was the construction by the British of the railroad line from Kantara on the Suez Canal to Gaza, and ultimately to Ludd and Haifa, together with the pipe line which supplied the workers and troops with water from the Nile. The supply of allied forces over this line, aided by the Arab camel corps organized and led by Thomas Lawrence, enabled General Allenby to complete the conquest of Palestine, and on Dec. 9, 1917, Izzat Bey, the Turkish civil governor, surrendered Jerusalem, at Romema, a suburb west of the city. Two days later the allied troops entered through the Jaffa Gate to complete the bloodless occupation of the city which has perhaps witnessed more bloodshed than any other spot on the planet. The Turks made a vigorous but futile attempt to retake Jerusalem on December 29. The final victory over the German-Turkish troops in Palestine was gained at Megiddo, the great battlefield of Palestine. In recognition of his conduct of the Palestine campaign General Allenby was made Field Marshal Viscount Allenby of Megiddo and Felixtowe. Thus ended four centuries of Turkish and thirteen of Moslem control of the Holy Land.

The problem of British administration in Palestine has been complicated by two apparently contradictory official commitments made to Arabs and Jews respectively. In 1915 Sir Henry McMahon, consular representative of the British government at Cairo, gave assurance to the Arab chiefs of the east-Jordan and Sinai regions that the Arab projects of independence, self-determination and territorial possession, in which Palestine was included, should be realized on the successful completion of the war. It was this pledge which enabled Lawrence to rally the Arabs to General Allenby's assistance, in delivering Palestine from Turkish control.

On November 2, 1917, Lord Balfour, British foreign minister, made a declaration in a letter to Lord Rothschild, to the effect that — " His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." In 1920 the treaty of Sèvres gave the mandate for Palestine, Transjordania and Iraq to Great Britain and that of Syria to France. On July 1 of that year, the civil administration of Palestine succeeded the military power. A High Commissioner was appointed in the person of the Rt. Hon. Sir Herbert Samuel. On July 24, 1922, the League of Nations confirmed the mandates. Neither Arabs nor Zionists, however, have been satisfied with the situation. Each party has demanded the fulfilment of the promises made to it, and charged the British administration with failure to comply with its pledges. The controversy came to sharp issue in the incident of the Wailing Wall on August 29, 1929, in which several casualties occurred and bitter feelings between Zionists and Arabs led to bloodshed in other places. The government is placed in the unhappy position of commitment to quite contradictory promises. In the nature of the case the outcome will be a compromise, but time alone can determine its nature, or the events that may take place meantime. Various commissions have reported on the problem, none of them to the satisfaction of either of the claimants. The troubles of Palestine are not yet at an end.[41]

Mention should be made of the towns and cities in Palestine which have had an important part in its history during successive periods. Among those belonging to Old Testament days were: Beersheba, Hebron, Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Jericho, Gaza, Joppa, Bethel, Shiloh, Shechem, Samaria, Beth-Shan, Megiddo, Jezreel, Tyre, Sidon and Dan.

In New Testament and Herodian times most of these remained, although in several instances their names were changed in honor of some notable (usually Roman) character, and new cities were built. Among those most familiar may be mentioned Hebron, Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Bethany, Jericho, Bethel, Lydda, Jamnia, Gaza, Askalon, Joppa, Antipatris, Caesarea, Ptolemais, Sabaste (Samaria), Scythopolis (Beth-Shan), Nazareth, Sepphoris, Capernaum, Tiberias, Tarachaë, Safed, Pella, Gadara, Hippos, Gerasa, Philadelphia, Tyre, Sidon, Caesarea-Philippi, and the fortresses of Hyrcanium, Alexandrium, Machaerus, Masada and Herodium. Many of these cities survived during the period of the crusades, and others, chiefly fortresses built by the knights, have been mentioned in connection with that age.

---

[41] See chapters XI, XII, pages 314, 344.

Modern Palestine has towns and cities which belong to all these periods, and many others which represent more recent enterprises, such as the Zionist colonies. The more familiar names at the present time are Beersheba, El-Arish, Gaza, Jaffa (Joppa), Ludd (Lydda), Ramlah, Jerusalem, Jericho, Es-Salt, Amman (Philadelphia), Jerash (Gerasa), Kerek, Nablous (Neapolis, Shechem), Haifa, Acre (Ptolemais), Tyre, Sidon, Nazareth, Tiberias, Safed, Banias (Caesarea-Philippi). Among Zionist colonies, some of which are towns or villages and some agricultural settlements, the following may be named: Tel-Aviv, Rischon le Zion, Mikweh Israel, Talpioth, Rosh Pinah, Artuf, Romema, Beth Hakarim, Kirya-Samwil, Ain Harod, Affuleh, Balfouria, Migdol, Metullah.

The German Templar colonies near Haifa, in Jerusalem and at Waldheim, are agricultural and missionary in purpose. Several missionary societies, Greek, Latin and Protestant, maintain churches, schools, hospitals, hospices and other religious agencies. Moslem mosques and schools are found in most towns. The Bahais have a sizable colony at Haifa. Probably the most interesting and historic small group is that of the Samaritans, now hardly more than a hundred in number, who live in a section of Nablous, and maintain an ancient synagogue under their high priest, Khaim Ishak, who claims descent from the classic priesthood of Israel.

Archaeological research in Palestine, long hindered by unfavorable governmental conditions under Turkish rule, has been prosecuted with fresh enthusiasm under the British mandate since the World War. To the older " finds " such as the Madeba Map, the Moabite Stone, the Siloam Inscription, the Warning Stone, etc., have been added many interesting and valuable materials excavated by the Palestine Exploration Fund, Harvard University, Yale University, the University of Pennsylvania, the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, the Pacific Theological Seminary, the British School of Archaeology, the German Oriental Society, the École Biblique of the Dominican Fathers of Jerusalem, and several other agencies, institutional and private. Sites of interest which have been excavated in part or wholly are Jerusalem, Gezer, Samaria, Beisan (Beth-Shan, Scythopolis), Tell Hum (Capernaum), Armageddon (Megiddo), Jericho, Beit Jibrin, Ain Shems (Beth Shemesh), Tell el-Ful (Gibeah of Saul), Beitin (Bethel), Seilun (Shiloh), Tell en-Nasbeh (Mizpah or Beeroth), Tell el-Hesy (Lachish or Eglon), Jerash (Gerasa), and Amman (Rabbath-Ammon, Philadelphia). A number of the identifications are as yet tentative. The skull of the so-called "Galilee Man," a fragment from prehistoric times, was found in a cavern near Tiberias. The work of scientific excavation and research in Palestine is as yet in its infancy, and much more important discoveries are likely to be made in the future. Even a casual inspection of the country reveals almost numberless "tells" or mounds which appear to be the sites of ancient cities, and are likely to prove of value to the archaeologist and the historian. The new archaeological museum erected outside the north-east corner of the city wall of Jerusalem through the generosity of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., will safeguard the hitherto endangered fruits of excavation imperiled by the four kinds of destroyers — war, earthquake, the natives, and the souvenir hunters — and will stimulate fresh activity in biblical research.

Palestine will continue through the years to hold the interest and attract the attention of the world. It is a land sacred to four faiths — Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and the Samaritans. It is the land from which have sprung the great ideas, literatures and personalities of religion — the worship of the one God, an ethical and imageless faith, a scripture that has become the classic of the race, and a group of prophets and teachers who have set the patterns of belief and conduct for half mankind. To it pilgrims, missionaries, ministers, rabbis, priests, teachers, students and travelers from every land have gone and will continue to go in even greater numbers. In its soil uncounted thousands have been buried as the happy consummation of a life pilgrimage, and untold measures of that soil have been brought to furnish the *camposantas* of Europe and to hallow the graves of the devout in every land.

Different emotions are evoked by a visit to Palestine, depending on the education, experience and interest of the visitor. There are those who are wholly disillusioned by the contrast between the measurable order and convenience of Europe and America and the discomfort, filth, fanaticism, religious rivalry and commercialism encountered in the Holy Land. On the other hand there are those who bring with them a high and romantic enthusiasm which renders them oblivious to all but the ideal and emotional values of the experience. They want to believe all that is told them regarding places and events in that land, and are unmoved by discords and discomforts that distress the comfort-loving tourist. To them Palestine remains the land of song and story, the lovely earthly symbol of the heavenly " land of pure delight."

To those, however, who go to Palestine with a reasonably prepared mind it brings neither of these impressions. They are not surprised by the poverty, the filth, the lack of conveniences and the presence of discomforts which are likely to confront any who journey in the orient. They know that Palestine has suffered from almost every evil which can afflict a country, war, pestilence, earthquake, deforestation, misrule, ignorance, superstition and all the ills that distress a plundered and exploited land. They know that, notwithstanding these facts, it has played one of the most remarkable rôles in history. It was the land in which prophets, priests, wise men and poets lived and found inspiration for their messages. It was the land in which Jesus lived, which he loved, and by whose tragedies he was not disheartened. It has been the land of great ethical and religious ideals, and is today the object of affection and hope. With all its limitations of size and resources, with all its tragedies of suffering and disappointment, Palestine is the most historic, eventful and beloved of areas, a land of hope and glory, made forever hallowed by the fact that "over its acres walked those sacred feet which [twenty] centuries ago were nailed for our advantage to the bitter cross."

II

HEBREW ORIGINS

At the time when Hebrew clans made their way into the hill country west of the Jordan sometime during the thirteenth century B.C. they found a numerous and diverse population, the result of many migrations and much admixture of races. The writers of the late book of Numbers reported that the scouts sent to explore the country brought back the disquieting news that there were many strong peoples living there, and that its conquest was impossible. They said that Amalek dwelt in the land of the south, and the Hittite and the Jebusite and the Amorite dwelt in the mountains, and the Canaanite dwelt by the sea and along by the side of Jordan.[1] Their picturesque phrase was that it was a land that "ate up its inhabitants," by which they apparently meant that one wave of population followed another, and all were at last mingled in a common mixture of stocks.

The names by which the region was known make clear the diversity of its population. The common designation appears to have been "Canaan" in the practice of Old Testament writers. If the ordinary view be accepted that this refers particularly to the lowlands of the coast and the Jordan trench, it may go back to an etymology not yet recovered, but accepted in the use of "Canaanite" for lowlander until it faded out into the sense of trafficker or merchant.[2] The Canaanites appear to have entered the land in some earlier movement of Semites from Aram and the farther east, accompanied perhaps by those who settled on the Phoenician coast, and founded Tyre and Sidon.

---

[1] Num. 13:29.

Another name applied to the land was the "hill country of the Amorites."[3] This people is very often mentioned in the Hebrew records, and appears to designate a large proportion of the population, particularly those who occupied the mountain range that gave to the country its chief characteristic. Much study has been given to the origin and relations of the Amorites, and the problem is still unsolved. But that they were a Semitic group from the north-east, and probably represent an earlier stratum of Palestinian population than the Canaanites, seems probable. Several of the Old Testament writers suggest the antiquity of their presence in the land. Their connection with the Hyksos invasion of Egypt and the regime of the so-called "shepherd kings" is a plausible conjecture. If so, their failure in Babylonia was in a measure retrieved in the Delta. As represented on the Egyptian monuments they had more of the characteristics of northern Europeans than of Semites, having long heads, blue eyes, yellow hair, straight noses and thin lips. At the time of the Hebrew arrival in Canaan, the Amorites held only a limited territory in the Lebanons, first under Egyptian and later Hittite overlords. Its capital was at Kadesh on the Orontes, and the last remnants of its power survived in Palestine in the two kingdoms on the east of the Jordan, those of Sihon of Heshbon and Og of Bashan.[4]

---

[2] See Prov. 31:24; Ezek. 17:4; Hos. 12:7; Zeph. 1:11; in each of which passages the word "Canaanite" in the Hebrew is translated "merchant," or "trafficker."

[3] Num. 13:29; Deut. 1:7, 19, 20.

A people of later advent were the Hittites, who were found in a few scattered cantonments, or mixed with the other inhabitants in the early days of Hebrew history. The Hittite race in Asia Minor was seemingly composed of three elements: the Khattish tribes of the region who gave their name to history; the Indo-European invaders from the west, whose influence is dominant in the Hittite language; and the Syrian Khurri, or Hurri, who perhaps formed one of the elements in the Hyksos movement. Whether the Hittites who were found in Palestine in the days of the patriarchs and the early monarchy were of the amalgamated race or were fragments of the Khatti group can hardly be determined. But the presence of "children of Heth" in Hebron in Abraham's day,[5] and the important place of Hittites in David's army,[6] together with the frequent inclusion of this people in the lists of races whom the Hebrews conquered, show the significance of this civilization in that period.

That there were also remnants of still earlier invasions among the scattered settlements in Canaan appears evident from the lists of racial or regional peoples so frequently repeated by the Hebrew chroniclers. The passages in which this nationalistic note of triumph is struck are sufficiently numerous to arrest the attention and excite the curiosity of the reader. Particularly are the Deuteronomists fond of running over the names of the peoples overcome and slaughtered or absorbed by the Hebrew clans. Usually these lists fall into groups of seven, and recite with true chauvinism such names as the Jebusites, Hivites, Perizzites, Horites, Rephaim, Avvim, Anakim, to say nothing of the more familiar Canaanites, Amorites and Hittites.[7] There is of course in these lists a curious and confused mingling of place names, clan names, racial designations and traditional and mythological reference. For example the Jebusites owed their name to the locality of Jebus, later Jerusalem, and were probably a Canaanite clan. One of their number sold land for a place of sacrifice to David,[8] and a census list in the book of Joshua speaks of their survival to that later time.[9]

---

[4] Numbers, chapt. 21; Deut. 1:4.

[5] Gen. 23:3–20.

[6] 1 Sam. 26:6; 2 Sam. 23:39.

The Horites have been thought to be the primitive cave-dwellers of the region, though the name may be a miswriting of Hivites, a petty people of central Palestine. The Perizzites were perhaps the villagers who lived in unwalled towns, or the name may have some connection with Girgashites, or Girzites, or even with Geshurites, and Gerizim, the sacred locality of the Samaritans. The Kenizzites, to which clan Caleb the leader of the tribe of Judah seems to have belonged,[10] were probably an Edomite group; and the Kenites, of whom were Heber and his Hebrew wife Jael,[11] seem to have been connected with Midianite tribes, and to have come in like the Kenizzites with Judah. Of the Rephaim no account can be given, save that they were reputed to be of gigantic size, as indeed were the Anakim, and other early inhabitants of the land. The tradition of giants in the earth in earlier days is not an infrequent heritage of unlettered people, and may be traced to a variety of causes.[12] Often such tribal names are personalized, and a mythical ancestor is contrived, as in the case of the Anakim, who in some of the passages are called " sons of Anak." Of other groups, like the Avvim, perhaps a Bedawin sept, or the Emim, Zamzummim, and the like, no satisfactory explanation has been given.

---

[7] Gen. 15:19–21; Ex. 3:8, 17; Deut. 7:1; 20:17; etc.

[8] 2 Sam. 24:16, 18.

[9] Josh. 15:63.

[10] Josh. 15:17; Judg. 1:13.

[11] Judg. 4:17.

Over the little land in which all these and other fragments of population were to be found, either persisting in segregated communities or, as more commonly, fused into a fairly uniform type by the pressure of the dominant governmental units, by intermarriages between contiguous communities, and by the danger of isolation, two world civilizations held sway, one of them political and the other cultural. The first was Egypt, whose widely extended power to the north and east was now declining and whose officials in Syria were ineffectually importuning their Pharaohs to send them aid to uphold the tottering fabric of control. Egypt was still nominally the mistress of these lands to the north, and when certain Hebrew clans left the Delta for the desert and finally arrived in Canaan, they were only leaving one part of the empire for another. The Egyptian structures, monuments, statues and other remains now emerging from Palestinian soil are ample evidence of this fact. There must have been an Egyptian element, official and commercial, in the population of the country, and as the historic highway across the desert to and from Egypt was constantly traversed by dwellers in the Nile valley,

---

[12] Gen. 6:4; Deut. 2:11; 3:11; Amos 2:9.

Egyptians, Nubians and men of other races, these southerners added constantly to the mixture of types in Canaan.

The second of these dominant influences was Babylonian. The political mastery of the coastlands including Palestine was an event of the future, though there were raids into the Mediterranean region by invaders from the Euphrates in patriarchal days.[13] But the prevailing cultural authority was Babylonian. The fact that the correspondence carried on between the Egyptian rulers of the fourteenth century and their Syrian governors was in the cuneiform character and the language of Babylon gives evidence of the prevalence of Mesopotamian culture and religion throughout the near east and to the borders of Egypt. That there were Babylonians resident in the land, as well as Babylonian commodities in the markets, appears evident from the sources.[14]

Into this land, already well peopled by men of diverse races thus mingled in something of a common stock, and possessed of certain centers of relatively competent culture such as Shechem, Hebron and Jericho, Hebrew clans began to make their way as early as the fifteenth century B.C. Like many of their Semitic predecessors they came out of the east, from Aram and the farther reaches of Babylonia and northern Arabia. The fact that they crossed the great river into Canaan seems to have given them the name of foreigners, " Hebrews," the men who " came over " from beyond, though some have attempted to derive the name from a mythical progenitor, Eber.[15] It is not improbable that the

[13] Genesis, chapt. 14.

[14] Josh. 7:21.

[15] Godbey, *The Lost Tribes a Myth,* pp. 38 ff., distinguishes between the

Semitic groups which settled on the east of the Jordan, such as Ammon, Moab and Edom, arrived about the same period as the Hebrews. Apparently the latter were not sufficiently numerous to disturb in any marked degree the population of the land. The traditions preserved by them connected certain patriarchal names with definite localities, as Abraham with Shechem and Hebron, Isaac with Beersheba and Jacob with Bethel. There were early and easy contacts with the people of the country. The Canaanite speech, customs and much of their religious cultus were absorbed by the newcomers, to whom the older inhabitants were glad to offer their hospitality and their alliances. That they were not at once lost in the life of the region speaks eloquently for the vigor of their immigrant stock and their capacity to begin a new chapter in clan history.

The patriarchal narratives preserved among the Hebrews make little of the idea of a separate and carefully guarded racial character among their people. The usual contacts, feuds, intermarriages, covenants and commercial dealings likely to prevail among neighbors were apparently the order of the time.[16] Nor was there any particular tendency to remain together. From the times of the first settlements the Hebrews moved easily and frequently into other areas. Echoes of this inclination are found in the records, usually in the form of individual adventures, but in reality carrying the implication of clan movements. Such de-

---

"Hebrews," whom he regards as an element in the Phoenician population and culture of Canaan — deriving their names from the fact that to the tribes east of the Jordan they were the people "over there," i.e. between the river and the sea — and the much later Aramaic "Israelites."

[16] Genesis, chapt. 23; 26:34; chapt. 34; 41:45.

partures into the desert regions south and east, the highlands of Aram, Philistia and Moab, though represented as personal experiences of Hebrew leaders, certainly hint at more general and permanent removals.[17]

The most notable of these migrations was the one which took a considerable group into Egypt, always the granery and asylum of the peoples of Syria. This departure to the Nile land has been by some connected with the more general movement of Amorites, Hittites and other Semites under the name of Hyksos, which produced so notable an upheaval in Egypt, and furnished that land with foreign rulers during the fifteenth and sixteenth dynasties. But it is evident from the only reference to Israel yet found on Egyptian monuments that there were remaining in Palestine in the reign of Merneptah some of these clans, sufficient in numbers to justify the reference, and that they had been subdued by the Pharaoh's forces in Syria.[18] It is probable that most of these people availed themselves of the inviting conditions in Egypt, and moved, either in a body or as is more likely in a gradual drift along the familiar road to the Delta. Here once more the opportunities for contact and integration were constant. The late writers and editors of the age following the great dispersion and the rise of Judaism were sensitive both to the racial and religious implications of these contacts, and lost no opportunity to emphasize the unity and separateness of Israel's life in all circumstances. This is a thesis which it is difficult to maintain, however, in face of the facts which their records disclose.[19]

---

[17] Gen. 25:1–6; 28:10; 39:1; 46:6, 7; Ex. 20:1; 24:34; 26:1; Ruth 1:1.

[18] The inscription on the stele of Merneptah (1225–1215 B.C.), along with other references to Palestine, contains the line "Israel is desolated, his seed is not." (Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 311.)

Some generations later the revival of the national spirit among the Egyptians led to the restoration of a native dynasty and more difficult days for all foreigners. At such a time a company of Hebrews made their way out of the Delta under the leadership of Moses. That they left many of their clansmen in the land where their recent ancestors had lived and been buried is hardly to be doubted. That they took with them Egyptians who had become members of their households by marriage is a probability.[20] The heritage of the land of the Nile remained with them for generations, and is made evident in their political and religious characteristics and the relations that prevailed between the two peoples throughout their history.

In the Sinai-Horeb region, wherever it may have been, somewhere to the east of Egypt and south of the Dead Sea, a new set of contacts and alliances awaited the Hebrew wanderers. A friendly tribe of nomads called Midianites gave them hospitality, and apparently contributed to the migrating clans some elements of their own civil and religious system, as well as members of their group through intermarriage.[21] When the Hebrews moved on, after some years, toward the highlands of Canaan, the region to which all the desert peoples looked with covetous longing, they seem to have taken with them fragments of the nomad groups in the midst of which they had been living. Some of these desert families were assimilated, and some maintained their separate, though friendly, relations after settlement in Palestine. Such families as the Kenites, Rechabites and others of this character appear to have persisted like gypsy camps throughout the history.[22]

---

[19] The traditions of the marriage of Joseph to an Egyptian wife (Gen. 41:45) and of Moses to a Midianitess (Ex. 2:21, 22) are indications of much more than individual alliances, and of the absence of any racial exclusiveness. Abraham's alliance with non-Hebrews (Gen. 16:3; 25:1–6) and Judah's marriage to a Canaanitess seem to have been regarded as entirely proper (Gen. 38:2).

[20] Cf. Lev. 24:10.

[21] Ex. 2:15–22; 18:1–27.

The Hebrews made their way into Palestine at various times and by different approaches. There seems to have been little concerted action. The leadership of Moses ended before the borders of Canaan were reached. Some attempts were made to enter from the south, but these were only partially successful.[23] The major approach was made through the highlands of Edom and Moab east of the Wady Musa and the Dead Sea. Later traditions told of opposition from the people of Moab both by armed forces and by incantations, as well as of contacts and alliances less creditable and more disastrous.[24] From this general region, accounted the territory of the related Semitic clans of Ammon and Moab, some of the Hebrews made their way, at various times and under different leaders, across the Jordan and into the coveted hill country to the west. That a considerable number were disinclined to face the difficulties and dangers of invasion of the central mountain range, and chose to remain on the east-Jordan plateau, is the testimony of the sources.[25] Explanations were made in the nature of apology for this defection, but the fact remains that to all intents these clans ceased to have interest in the common adventure, and were gradually lost to the Hebrew cause, either by absorption in the surrounding population or by decreasing concern with the affairs of their bolder brethren. In days when a common danger summoned the west-Jordan tribes to a united stand, these clansmen showed no interest, and were taunted as recreants.[26] The names of Reuben, Gad and Gilead were held in slight regard, even when they were included at all in the national registers.

---

[22] Judg. 4:17–24; Jer. 35:1–19.

[23] Num. 14:36–45; 21:1–3.

[24] Num. 21:21–25:18.

[25] Numbers, chapt. 32. In spite of the Levitical sentiments of the writers of Numbers, a portion of the late Priest Code, they record the fact that

Of the two narratives of the occupation of Canaan contained in the Old Testament, the books of Judges and Joshua, the former is the older and more authentic. It makes clear the gradual and difficult task of securing a foothold in a land already populous and superior in culture and military strength. According to this narrative the Hebrew clans entered where and when they could, and took such portions of the territory as they were able to seize and hold. It was a case of every tribe for itself, if such a term as tribes can be applied to the various bands of invaders who under numerous leaders secured a partial and precarious lodgment in the land. It was a slow and hazardous process. As in patriarchal days there were feuds, alliances and interrelations by marriage and otherwise. Only now these contacts spread over a much wider territory and were of much more permanent nature. Conflicts were frequent, and results were often only partial. But little by little the hardihood and

---

a body of Midianite women, thirty-two thousand in number, was incorporated into Israel at this time (Num. 31:35). This hints that they were little concerned with the notion of racial purity.

[26] Judg. 5:15, 16.

vigor of the Hebrews prevailed, and the native population was subdued and absorbed. The ultimate disappearance of the Amorite, Canaanite and other types of racial grouping, if such had not already measurably vanished in the amalgam of stocks, was due far less to war than to assimilation.[27] As in many other historic instances such as the Normans in England in which an invading race is absorbed in the conquered population, or is sufficiently numerous and virile to become the dominant factor in the new racial mixture, so the Hebrews both melted into and slowly transformed the peoples of Palestine into a new and potential race, with many both of the good and the evil qualities of the constituent groups. In the course of generations the Hebrew type emerged, made up like the American, of many different racial qualities, but becoming measurably distinctive at last, though constantly enriched and modified by fresh infusions of non-Hebrew blood.

The other narrative, the late priestly record of the book of Joshua, presents a far more romantic and patriotic picture of the occupation of the land. This is not a slow and painful penetration, but a brilliant, rapid and complete conquest. The Hebrews, not a scattered and unorganized complex of clans, but a united and disciplined people, are led by Joshua, the divinely selected successor of Moses, to the accompaniment of constant and astonishing miracles, in the total subjugation of the country. This is accomplished chiefly in three decisive battles within the space of seven years. The population of Palestine is practically exterminated by the victorious Hebrews, and the survivors, a mere remnant, are put under bond to good behavior. When the conquest has been completed, the tribes, clearly named and classified in accordance with their later experiences and traditions, are assigned by the sacred lot to their respective territories in a great convocation at the venerable sanctuary of Shechem, and without demur they betake themselves to their allotments and presumably live happily ever after. The priestly and nationalistic character of this account is patent. The supernatural element is outstanding as in the late book of Esther. It is a "hundred per cent" Hebrew document. There is no problem of contact or assimilation with the native population, for that disturbing element is wiped out in well-nigh universal massacre. This is the story of the capture of Canaan as it ought to have taken place, in the thought of late patriots who looked back on a completely organized nation, whose tribal traditions had hardened into history.

---

[27] E.g. Rahab, Josh. 2:1–24; 6:17–25; Matt. 1:4; Samson, Judg. 14:1, 2; 15:15, etc.

If then the oldest Hebrew sources are to be trusted, it would appear that this people was derived from an unusual mingling of racial elements. A Deuteronomist affirms that a wandering Aramean was their father,[28] and Ezekiel, a staunch nationalist, put into the mouth of deity the taunting words, "By origin and birth you belong to the land of the Canaanites. Your father was an Amorite, and your mother a Hittite."[29] Palestine was the cross-roads of the ancient world. All the caravans and armies that passed from the lands of the Babylonians, Mitannians, Arameans, Hittites and Syrians to Egypt and back had to traverse this narrow bridge which lay between the desert and the sea. And, as in later centuries, few of these passing companies failed to leave on the way the populational driftwood which an inviting region always lures from wayfaring bands. In all historic time Palestine, especially in its cities, has exhibited one of the most complex populations to be found in any part of the world. And the sources indicate that the same conditions prevailed in the years when the Hebrews were taking root in the land. That the dominant element in this diverse population, including the Hebrews as they gradually attained the mastery, was Semitic there can be little doubt. But that term, then as now, included many peoples who spoke related tongues without having close relationships of blood. In fact, the claim has been made, probably too broadly, that there never has been a Semitic race in any sense which involves unity of blood.[30] An interesting illustration of that fact may be observed at the present time in the crowd of pilgrims at Mecca. Though these multitudes who throng the sacred places of Islam are all known as Arabs, and are most jealous of their ethnic and religious exclusiveness, they belong to many tribes that have not the slightest connection with the genuine Arab of Semitic stock. In fact, with the exception of the Sharifian families descended from the Prophet and some few others of real Arab origin, the entire population of Mecca is non-Semitic, including as it does Indians, Persians, Turks, Javanese and Negroes.[31]

---

[28] Deut. 26:5.

[29] Ezek. 16:3.

What may have been the physical characteristics of these early Hebrews cannot be stated with certainty. It would seem that they had straight noses, large, straight mouths, narrow, high, sloping foreheads. It is now believed that the type of countenance which has been found on some of the monuments and described as Hebrew was rather an inheritance from the non-Semitic, Armenoid element in the Canaanite population, due to Hittite and Mitannian influence. Perhaps also something of the fair color and Greek cast of countenance came from the infusion of Philistine traits.[32] It can hardly be said that any one prevailing physiological type has persisted in Palestine. A migrating people tends to take on the characteristics of the populations in the midst of which it lives,[33] like the Jews of later centuries; and though the Hebrews of the classic age were fairly stable in their habitat, they were constantly influenced by the movements of the peoples about them, and this may well have had its effect upon the continuity of their racial type.

---

[30] McCown, *Genesis of the Social Gospel,* p. 76.

[31] Riza-Tewfik, *Asia,* Vol. XXX (March 1930) p. 166.

The names by which the various groups of Hebrews came to be known were probably derived from the localities in which they found settlement.[34] As time went on these tribal names were assumed to be those of their clan ancestors, the legendary sons of the eponym hero Jacob-Israel. The location of these tribes remained relatively unchanged through the history, and gradually the character of each of the tribes provided a profile for the traditional ancestor. Such portraits are to be found in the two tribal epics put by later poets into the mouths of Jacob and Moses respectively, as found in the closing chapters of Genesis and Deuteronomy.[35] Nothing more beautiful and fitting is found in the literature of this people than these two national hymns, in which something of the location, character, animal symbols or totems, and history of the different tribes is recalled.

---

[32] McCown, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[33] Ripley, *Races of Europe;* Boas, *Descendants of Emigrants.*

[34] "The ancient records present the fact that place-names like Asher, Gad, Zebulun, were known in Palestine centuries before any Israelites were there." Godbey, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

And thus the nation that was destined to take its place along with the two others that have done most to shape western history, came into being in that little land of the near east, the highway of the nations. For Greece, Rome and Israel have been the intellectual, the institutional and the spiritual teachers of the occident. And of the three the Hebrews more profoundly influenced the religious life of both east and west than either of the others. For out of Israel came that monotheism which produced three daughter faiths — Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism. And from the surviving writings of that Hebrew race came the impulse that brought into being the three daughter literatures — the New Testament, the Talmud and the Koran.

---

[35] Genesis, chapt. 49; Deuteronomy, chapt. 33.

III

HEBREW CONTACTS, ACCRETIONS AND DISPERSIONS

About the time that Hebrew clans were finding a place of settlement in Canaan, another people, the Philistines, were taking possession of the maritime plain in the south-west portion of the same country.[1] The Old Testament writers speak of them as coming from Caphtor, which has been supposed to refer either to the island of Crete or to the south-western coastland of Asia Minor. They are indeed called Caphtorites by the Deuteronomist, by Amos and Jeremiah; and in many places they are spoken of as Cherethites. The combined name Cherethites-Pelethites has often been equated with Cretans-Philistines, as implying their western and island origin.[2] A favorable view is taken in many quarters of the theory that Hellenic tribes from the north moved down upon Crete overthrowing the Minoan civilization and accomplishing the tragedy of Knossos.[3] According to this theory Cretans fled south-eastward across the sea toward Egypt, or the marauders themselves may have taken that pursuing course. About the same period similar western Hellenic hordes swept down upon the Hittite peoples of central Asia Minor and crushed them. Refugees from one or both of these waves of conquest traveling both by land and sea attempted to settle in Egypt, but were forced back by Ramses III, about 1190 B.C., and took possession of the coast of Canaan. Later confusion of their colonies with the total population of the country, in the minds of Egyptian and Greek geographers, gave their name, Palastu, to the entire region, which gradually came to be known as Philistia, Palistia, or Palestine. Although the country bore many different names in the speech of its own and neighboring peoples through its history, in the centuries since the Byzantine period it has borne consistently the name of Palestine.

---

[1] 1 Sam. 4:1.

[2] Deut. 2:23; 1 Sam. 30:14, 16; Amos 9:7; Jer. 47:4; Zeph. 2:4, 5.

[3] Baikie, *The Amarna Age,* p. 179.

The Philistines were not a Semitic people. They are the one race that in the Old Testament is regularly spoken of as "the uncircumcised,"[4] that rite being the recognized mark of men of Semitic stock. In appearance and culture they belonged to the Indo-European family. Yet it would appear that they soon adopted much of the speech and religion of the Semitic population around them. They settled in the area from which they had driven out the primitive inhabitants,[5] and built their five cities, Gaza, Askelon, Ashdod, Ekron and Gath,[6] and the suburbs or "daughter villages,"[7] into a state that survived for centuries. That they brought the arts of war with them from the west is indicated by their ability to hold their walled cities in the pathway of the commerce and military traffic which constantly passed their way. It is also shown by the early and continued hostilities with the Hebrews and the Amorites which presently compelled those dwellers in the highlands to organize into some semblance of a kingdom. With the Jebusite stronghold of Jerusalem dividing the tribes north and south, the presence of an aggressive people like the Philistines on the south-west was a serious menace.[8]

---

[4] 1 Sam. 17:26, 36; 31:4.

[5] Deut. 2:23.

[6] 1 Sam. 6:17; Amos 1:7; Zech. 9:5.

[7] See 2 Chron. 28:18, and note the use of the (Hebrew) word "daughters" for the smaller towns.

The relations of the Hebrews with the Philistines were constant and varied. In the days of the judges they were regarded as unpleasant neighbors, though there were dealings and intermarriages with them, as the Samson traditions suggest.[9] A little later they overwhelmed the Hebrews at the battle of Aphek, carried away the ark and sacked the sanctuary town of Shiloh.[10] During the brief and ineffectual leadership of Saul they were a constant threat, and finally wrought the disaster of Mt. Gilboa.[11] Already, however, Hebrews like David were finding refuge from troubles at home by taking service with Philistine chiefs as mercenaries. When David was chosen king, his neighbors in the lowland were alarmed, and made efforts to frustrate the enterprise, but were subdued in a series of battles,[12] and from that time on were not a serious menace to the Hebrew states. David took the Philistine city of Gath and added it to the territories of Israel, and he employed Philistine soldiers as his bodyguard,[13] a custom followed by many other kings in history, who preferred to have men of foreign speech as their personal escort. After the division of the kingdom there were occasional and apparently rather unsuccessful attacks upon the Philistine frontier fortress of Gibbethon,[14] but the territory and influence of the shore-land people decreased with the years. In the times of Amos the men of their cities were denounced for carrying on traffic in slaves with Edom, the slave market of the region.[15] In spite of natural intermarriage and fusion with adjacent clans, and repeated losses to Egypt and Assyria by invasion and plundering, the Philistines were able to maintain their existence till the fifth century B.C., particularly after the successive downfall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Intermarriage between them and the struggling Jewish state is recorded in the days of Nehemiah, insomuch that the children of these mixed marriages used the Philistine speech on the streets of Jerusalem.[16] But absorption and attrition wrought their effects on the pentapolis by the sea, and before the Maccabean age the Philistines disappeared from history.

---

[8] Masterman, *The Philistines.*

[9] Judges, chapts. 13–16.

[10] 1 Samuel, chapt. 5; Ps. 78:59, 60; Jer. 7:12, 14; 26:9.

[11] 1 Samuel, chapt. 31.

[12] 2 Sam. 5:17–25.

[13] 2 Sam. 8:18; 15:18.

The contact and assimilation between the Hebrews and the Philistines was an example of what occurred between Israel and the other races of Palestine, only that the Philistines retained their integrity and their separate existence longer than most of the others, owing to their militant character, their more remote location and their non-Semitic strain. In the other instances there were no such safeguards, and where both natural inclination and the pressure of circumstances favored absorption into the dominant state, it was inevitable that the older races disappeared into the Hebrew population.[17] In the wars of David the entire region of Palestine east and west was subdued, and its people incorporated in his kingdom. This did not imply the extinction of states like Ammon, Moab and Edom, nor of Phoenicia. They remained, like the Philistine cities. But contacts were constant. Trade, and even war, resulted in relations that made for integration. The little Jebusite enclave was engulfed and Jerusalem became the capital.[18] Friendly relations were established with Tyre and Sidon, which furnished Israel with artisans as well as building materials from the Lebanons in the days of David and Solomon. The fact that Hiram the architect of the temple was the son of a Tyrian father and a mother from the tribe of Dan was an example of the free marital relations of the time. Military service in Hebrew armies was no exceptional adventure on the part of foreigners, as in the cases of Ittai the man from Gath, Uriah the Hittite, married to a Hebrew woman afterward the mother of Solomon, Obil the Ishmaelite, and Jazziz the Hagrite, all of whom held responsible positions as overseers of substance among David's officers, reminding us of Doeg the Edomite, the chief of Saul's herdsmen.[19]

---

[14] I Kings 15:27; 16:17.

[15] Amos 1:6.

[16] Neh. 13:23, 24.

[17] Cf. the story in Judges 21:13–23 of the abduction of the two hundred Canaanite maidens of Shiloh by the man of Benjamin.

As in the times of the judges, so in the years following the establishment of the kingdom, the desert tribes, envious of the comparative wealth of the west-Jordan area, swarmed across the river at every favorable opportunity and secured whatever plunder they could seize. The fortresses were few and inadequate, and many of the invaders chose to remain where they could find a footing. There was constant infiltration from the steppe in the days of David, of Ahab and of Jehu. Elijah himself is an example of the nomadic peoples that contributed to the national stock.[20] In the reigns of strong kings like Solomon and his successors, both in the north and the south, many strangers were attracted to the land as a desirable home. Solomon and Ahab, like Herod in later days, were eager to encourage the growth of the nation. The example of intermixture with other races was set by the kings themselves, whose harems were recruited from all the neighboring peoples, and whose many children poured their mixed blood into the life stream of Israel.[21] Far from disclosing any desire to restrict the population to Hebrew stock, such sovereigns as Solomon, Ahab, Uzziah and the two Jeroboams adopted the open door policy in their dealings with the non-Hebrew peoples, and even established free trade, with designated quarters for this reciprocal intercourse, both in their own capitals and in other lands.[22] Doubtless the poorer classes, attached to the soil and their industries, were little affected by these changing customs. But the court circles and the wealthier classes in close imitation adopted the free manners of the age, and paid little regard to any restriction of social contacts. The principle of endogamy is strong among primitive peoples, and this appears to have had its influence in the earlier years of Hebrew life. But with the growth of the nation in culture and wealth it ceased to be effective, and intermarriage with non-Hebrews was apparently accepted as both permissible and desirable.

---

[18] 2 Sam. 5:4–12.

[19] 1 Sam. 21:7; 2 Sam. 15:19–22; 1 Chron. 27:30, 31.

---

[20] 1 Kings 17:1.

[21] In imitation of other oriental rulers David assembled a harem of wives and concubines (2 Sam. 3:2–5; 5:13–16), some of whom were foreigners. In Solomon's time the royal harem included, according to the writers of Kings, seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines (1 Kings 11:1–3). The fact that these wives are called "princesses" shows that they were from other racial groups, and they are said to have come from Egypt, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Phoenicia and the Hittites. The mother of Rehoboam, who succeeded Solomon as king, was an Ammonitess. Although the prophetic writers deprecated this practice, it was on religious rather than racial grounds, and there is a note of pride in their references to the huge royal establishments. Certainly there was no interest on their part in any principle of racial purity.

[22] 1 Kings 20:34.

In the stricter circles of prophets and priests the growing evils of idolatry, the result of these foreign contacts, were sternly disapproved, and in the codes, beginning with Deuteronomy, they were condemned.[23] But there is little evidence that such laws were ever given serious consideration in the life of the people, and an argument might be made that they were hardly intended to represent more than a sentiment of national loyalty. There were other laws, not a few, which it would have been difficult if not impossible to enforce, and which may be regarded rather as counsels of perfection than actual mandates. However, the presence of laws against intermarriage with foreigners in the codes as well as repeated warnings in the historical material would indicate that the custom was common, and constituted in the minds of the stricter legalists a problem of some significance. The contrast between the prophetic attitude and that of the more successful kings is illustrated by the opposing policies of Solomon, and Ahijah the prophet of Shiloh; of the popular and aggressive Ahab, and Elijah the valiant champion of Hebrew separatism; or of Isaiah pleading for complete isolation, and kings like Ahaz and Hezekiah whose conduct plunged the nation into the vortex of foreign entanglement.

[23] Deut. 7:1–5, etc.

In the period of Israel's growing wealth and importance the small group of moral leaders who were the true interpreters of national integrity as well as of religious ideals pleaded ceaselessly against the growing secularism of the times, the tendency to look to the neighboring peoples for fashions in dress and in manners, and to forget the divine sanctions which alone gave the nation its pattern of belief and conduct and its justification for existence. To a discouraging degree the spiritual guides of Israel spoke to inattentive audiences, or found their words confused with the smooth and easy utterances of prophets of the popular order to whom the national success and emulation of the civilizations about them were of chief concern. The fatal character of such policies and preachments was disclosed when all too swiftly Israel and Judah paid the price of their short-sighted conduct and were washed out of history by the onsweeping waves of foreign invasion, leaving only the warnings and admonitions of their great seers as an imperishable legacy to later centuries.

Never during all these years was the Hebrew race kept free from the constant infusion of foreign blood and ideas. Especially was this true of the cities, where contacts with non-Hebrew life were continuous and powerful. This was even more true of the northern kingdom than of Judah, where the proportion of nomadic stock was greater, and the presence of the temple and the Davidic court safeguarded in some degree the conservatism of the peasant population. But even in the south there were ceaseless contact and assimilation of outside influences, and the little state was too small and too weak to resist them. In the north there were few safeguards to the earlier ideals of Israel. The land lay open and inviting to foreign exploitation. As Isaiah said, it was like a ripe fig, waiting to be plucked by the first passer-by.[24] Though the people north and south were still Hebrews, they were not of that stout and hardy order of men whose fathers had subdued the land and made a nation. The blood of different clans flowed in their veins.

If the tribes with which the nation started, according to the traditions, had been undisturbed through the history they would have preserved to a greater degree the conventions of Hebrew life and promoted the sense of local loyalties. But one of the innovations introduced by Solomon was the redivision of the territory into twelve districts which ignored the earlier tribal boundaries, and shattered to a certain extent the consciousness of tribal integrity.[25] From that time onward the older boundaries lost in a measure their significance. It was probably impossible to eradicate the sentiment of tribal attachment, even if it had been the deliberate design. But nothing stabilizes a people's unity of purpose like its devotion to the district in which it has lived, and when that sense of historic continuity is destroyed much is lost. The tribes of Israel could not be wiped out entirely by any process of gerrymandering such as Solomon undertook. But this policy together with the mutations which war and other changing conditions brought modified the pattern of Israel's territorial placements and had its effects upon the land.

Some of the tribes quite lost out. Simeon was absorbed into Judah and disappeared. The east-Jordan clans faded from the picture. The far northern groups ceased to have a part in national affairs, and were drawn naturally into Phoenician relations.[26] The idea of "twelve tribes" was cherished, though there was not agreement regarding their actual identity, and the lists were different.[27] The preponderant strength of the two powerful clans of Ephraim and Judah overshadowed all the others, and resulted in the natural cleavage between the two, which was of very early origin, and presently caused the division of the nation.[28] There were of course loyalties preserved in all the areas of Israel which would not permit the old tribal names and memories to die out. Such are to be found in these late poems, the odes of the tribes, which kept alive ancient traditions long after the tribes themselves had vanished from history,[29] and they are even echoed in the New Testament.[30] As will be seen later there came a time when the passion for genealogical connection with the past took strong hold on people who believed themselves capable of claiming even the most tenuous connection with the classic race of the Hebrews. In such instances a lineage is not a difficult contrivance, and

---

[24] Isa. 28:4.

[25] 1 Kings 4:7–19, 27.

[26] 1 Kings 9:11, 12.

[27] Gen. 35:23–26; Ex. 28:21. A comparison of the various lists of the tribes shows that although the general notion of twelve persisted, the names varied in the different enumerations. Some included and some omitted such names as Joseph, Levi, Ephraim, Manasseh. Cf. the national poems already referred to, and such passages as Deut. 27:11–14; the variant lists in Ezekiel, chapt. 48, and the "Domesday Book" of Israel in Joshua, chapts. 13–19.

[28] There was never any real unity between the north and the south. Southern Judah was closely affiliated with Kenites (Judg. 1:16), Edomites, Jerahmealites, and other desert tribes. David sent presents to Edomite and Jerahmealite villages in the south (1 Sam. 30:26–31). Abner's contemptuous words, "Am I a dog's head of Judah?" reflects the hostility between the two sections (2 Sam. 3:8).

[29] Genesis, chapt. 49; Deuteronomy, chapt. 33.

[30] Acts 26:7; Jas. 1:1; Rev. 7:5–8.

whether valid or fanciful, it lends itself to family pride, and in some degree to social prestige.

But if Israel received frequent infusions of foreign blood from the neighboring peoples, even more evident is the series of losses sustained through the repeated shocks of war and expatriation. It has been seen that from the very beginnings of the story of the Hebrews in Palestine individuals and groups had taken their way into other lands. Travel and trade were never intermitted, and they always involved settlement in extra-Palestinian regions. But it was invasion from without and civil war within that took grim toll of Israel's vitality and made impossible such a national career as would have given the people a real place in the sun. The jealousies between the two sections of the state which flamed out into rebellion at the close of Solomon's reign were but the culmination of tensions and feuds which had required all the skill of David and the authority of his son to hold in check. The same feeling kept the two little states of Israel and Judah embroiled with each other through most of the years of their parallel course. Civil strife characterized the succession of dynastic changes that marked the history of the northern kingdom, where king after king was assassinated by a successful rival. War in that age as in modern times always takes the best manhood of a people and leaves it impoverished in blood and treasure. The terrible reforms of Jehu, though encouraged by the prophets, were the occasion of such massacres of the leaders and the resourceful members of the community in Samaria as must have lowered the vitality of the state for a generation. These were but episodes in a history that was replete with tragedy both in the north and the south, and set barriers of hatred and devastation across the pathway of Israel's progress. In spite of revivals of strength under such kings as Jeroboam II and Uzziah, the dual kingdoms grew too weak to survive the shocks of fate from without.

Those shocks came in sequences which left scant time for recovery. The Israel of the dynasties of Omri and Jehu received crushing blows in wars with Syria, as Sir George Adam Smith has eloquently pointed out.[31] These convulsions permitted desert dwellers to come in and take root as securely as Israel had done at the first. The sack of Jerusalem by Shishak of Egypt in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign was a heavy blow to the pride and the wealth of the city that Solomon had beautified and enriched,[32] and it meant a large deportation of captives to Egypt. We read that in the reign of Jehoram of Judah there was an invasion by "the Philistines and the Arabians that were beside the Ethiopians, who came against Judah and broke into it and carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house, and his sons and his wives."[33] We are told that in the time of Joash the Syrians came against Jerusalem and Judah and destroyed all the princes and a very great host, and took the spoil of them to Damascus.[34] And if the Chronicler leaves himself open to suspicion in the almost incredible figures in which he recounts these and many other misfortunes that befell Judah — such as that in the reign of Ahaz the king of Syria carried away a great multi-

[31] *Historical Geography of the Holy Land,* pp. 58 ff.

[32] 1 Kings 14:25, 26; 2 Chron. 12:1–9.

[33] 2 Chron. 21:16, 17.

[34] 2 Chron. 24:23.

tude of captives, and that Pekah of Israel slew in Judah a hundred and twenty thousand in one day, all of them valiant men, and that in that contest two hundred thousand captives were carried away together with great store[35] — it is probable that allowing for much exaggeration sinister facts lie behind these lurid recitals, facts that throw solemn light on the causes of the national debacle.

It must be kept in mind, as bearing on the question of racial integrity, that every invasion or other military contact led inevitably to plunder, ravage, violation of women, and the other tragedies that war involves. One of the frequently recurring references in the sources relates to the outrages committed by foreign soldiers on the womanhood of Israel. These sinister allusions, either in actual narrative or in sombre anticipation, run all through the history from Egyptian days to the final catastrophe.[36]

Whatever may have been the possibilities of Israel's becoming a world power in the times when the state arose with such promise under David and Solomon, that hope was forever dispelled by the conquest of Samaria and the dispersion of her people. One is tempted to picture a great empire with its capital at Jerusalem or Samaria. To be sure the country was small, "the least of all lands," it has been called. Yet other nations that became world rulers had small beginnings and little territory. Rome at the first was but a cluster of settlements among the Alban hills. Greece was a diminutive state. Egypt, Babylon and Assyria began as city powers.

---

[35] 2 Chron. 28:5, 6.

[36] Notice the statements or the implications of such passages as Ex. 15:9; Deut. 28:30, 32; Judg. 5:30; 2 Kings 8:12; 15:16; Isa. 13:16; Lam. 3:51; 5:10; Amos 1:3, 13; Zech. 14:2.

Palestine was in the center of the oriental world, at the crossroads of the nations. It had open pathways to all lands, and yet was in a location impregnable on its mountains. Probably something like this dream filled the minds of Rehoboam's youthful advisers when they urged him to push on to the imperial objectives of his father. But the prophets were of a different mind. They chose a moral rather than a political empire, and by rending the nation asunder they made futile all future efforts to build up a world state on that soil. If one is thinking in terms of a majestic kingdom, he can never forgive Ahijah of Shiloh and his colleagues. But if he is thinking of the course of morality and religion, he knows that they saved a broken and defeated Israel for a nobler adventure.[37]

The event which proved the beginning of the end and rang down the curtain on the major section of the Hebrew drama was the fall of northern Israel in 721 B.C. The invasion by Shalmaneser IV and the three years siege of Samaria culminated in its conquest by Sargon II, and its disappearance from history for some centuries. Already in the reign of Pekah, in the crisis of 734 B.C., Tiglath-pileser III had raided the northern kingdom, carrying away a great company of captives.[38] But far more tragic was the event of 721. This was the latest of several eruptions of the Assyrians into Palestine, and it was not the last. But it was crushing and final so far as the kingdom of Israel was concerned. The usual policy was followed in the treatment of a conquered people. Those of the inhabitants who were resourceful or likely to breed further trouble were taken out of the

[37] 1 Kings, chapt. 12.

[38] 2 Kings 15:29.

land. This would probably be but a small proportion of the population, for there was no wisdom in expending unnecessary effort and expense in a mere act of reprisal. Sargon's record asserts that he deported 27,300 of the people. This would probably leave a large proportion of the Israelites undisturbed. But they were a broken, leaderless community, and to make the situation more desperate, Sargon adopted the customary Assyrian device of bringing in foreign settlers to break still further the spirit of the unhappy Hebrews. The biblical record states that the exiles were "carried away into Assyria and placed in Halah, and in Habor on the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."[39] There they were absorbed into the population of the country, as was the intention of their masters. They made no history in the new world of their expatriation, and left no literature. In this they were less fortunate than the Judean exiles of a later generation. Eager inquiries have been made in modern times as to what really became of the "ten lost tribes," and fantastic guesses have been ventured. Of course they were never "lost" in the sense that something can be mislaid. Like many other racial groups under the ruthless policies of Assyria and Babylonia they "lost out," lost their place in history, their national inheritance and their land.[40]

The people who were brought in to take their places were no doubt the subjects of similar disciplinary measures, perhaps participants in revolts against the Assyrian government. They are said to have come from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath and Sepharvaim.[41] The annals of Sargon say that the newcomers represented four desert tribes, the Tamudi, Ibadidi, Marsimani and Haiappai.[42] This meant a new infusion of nomadic blood, such as the wars both civil and foreign had encouraged for centuries. Tribes which disturbed the empire could be moved or allowed to migrate. As long as the customary tribute was paid it mattered little what people occupied a province. So far as the dominant power on the Tigris was concerned, the fate of a little people in the distant region they were accustomed to call the "land of Omri" was of small moment. And so another nation, one more of many to suffer such a fate, passed out of history.

---

[39] 2 Kings 17:6.

[40] Godbey, *The Lost Tribes a Myth,* particularly chapter 1.

[41] 2 Kings 17:24.

And yet it did not entirely lose its life. It had given to the world a great succession of moral leaders whose names and messages were to continue as beacon lights through the centuries. Those forceful personalities, Samuel, Ahijah, Elijah, Elisha, Amos and Hosea belonged either in their nativity or their ministries to the northern kingdom, and there must have been many others of their order unnamed in the records whose work carried to wider areas the teaching of these masters in Israel. Their activities produced little fruitage in the life of the nation. But their line has gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. The prophets of Judah, to whom now fell the responsibility for Israel's testimony, built upon the foundation they had laid, and the confessors of Christianity and of Judaism today count these great souls of the north and the south as having one voice in the spiritual education of the race.

In one other aspect the kingdom of Israel continued to function after its apparent decease. In the midst of the

[42] Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, p. 210.

heathenism that prevailed in Palestine as the result of the mixture of men of different stocks and cults,[43] there must have been many of the unhappy people who clung to their ancient law, the Book of the Covenant, and cherished the teachings of Moses and the prophets. Whether they were scattered or grouped in communities they contrived to remain faithful to the memories of the past, and to hope for better days. Little is known of these survivors of Israel, but gradually they came to be known as Samaritans, from the name of the capital city of Israel, and when they are encountered further down the years they have an organic existence, a sense of loyalty to the Hebrew traditions, and a deep and growing conviction that they alone are preserving the sanctities of the classic age, endangered by what they regard as the schismatic movement under way at Jerusalem. The ampler story of the Samaritan community falls to a later stage of this inquiry. But the student of religion, and especially the one who endeavors to trace the outgoings of the Hebrew life, will not fail to give due attention to this Samaritan group, which through all the mutations of time has maintained its existence and continued its claim to be the authentic representative of ancient Israel.

[43] 2 Kings 17:25–33.

IV

DECLINE AND FALL OF JUDAH: CLOSE OF HEBREW HISTORY

The collapse of the kingdom of Israel in 721 B.C. under the blows of Assyria did not at once bring to an end the Hebrew age in Palestine. It might well have had this result, so far as the relative strength of the two kingdoms was concerned, for through most of the history Judah was the smaller and weaker of the two states, and much of the time it was hardly more than a war vassal of Israel. It had its brief periods of success, as in the brilliant reign of Uzziah. But from the times of Ahaz and his unfortunate alliance with Assyria it was torn between Assyrian and Egyptian leanings, and as Hosea said of Israel, it was like a silly dove that turned this way and that for help.[1] Undoubtedly the continuity of the temple services and the Davidic dynasty were the chief stabilizing influences. But the wavering policies of successive rulers, and the increasing weakness of the little state foretold an early disruption. The interval from 721 to 586 B.C. was an all-too-brief extension of the Hebrew régime. It included the maturer years of Isaiah's ministry, the half century of Jeremiah's preaching, and the activities of other notable leaders, prophetic and priestly. But the end was in sight. It was at best the Indian summer of Israel's season of opportunity. And as Jeremiah said sadly, "the harvest is past, the summer is ended."[2]

---

[1] Hos. 7:11.

During much of this period the authority and influence of Assyria were dominant in the country. From the reign of Ahaz until the fall of Nineveh the foreigner was in control, though there were moments when Judah dreamed of independence and thereby incurred heavier discipline. When Assyria fell before the assault of the rising power of the new Babylonian state, the foreign control merely passed from one hand to another, to the astonishment and despair of prophets like Habakkuk, who were hoping, like India today, for the end of alien dominion. In fact there was hardly a time in the entire story of Hebrew life when the record might not have been written in terms of one or another of the long succession of powers that held partial or complete overlordship in Palestine. The list includes Egyptians, Philistines, Syrians, Assyrians and Persians; and in the days following the rise of the Jewish state, with the exception of the brilliant years of Maccabean power, the same foreign type of control continued under Egyptian, Syrian and Roman rule. As Sir George Adam Smith declares, Palestine has never belonged to any one people and never will. And now the end was in sight. The prophets felt the burden of the approaching tragedy of the nation's collapse. Isaiah took comfort in the thought of the remnant that should survive, but that remnant in reality was not to be a political state but an ethical and spiritual realm. Jeremiah was confident that after the years of discipline the nation was to be restored to its former glory.[3] But these dreams were never realized.

---

[2] Jer. 8:20.

Even more serious than the subjection of the land to the authority of the great empires on the Tigris and the Euphrates was the constant eruption of neighboring tribes into the territory of Judah. The Chronicler insists that it was not strange that Ahaz should appeal to Assyria for help, for in addition to his serious problem of meeting the Syro-Ephraimite emergency, "the Edomites had come and smitten Judah and carried away captives. The Philistines also had invaded the cities of the lowland and of the south of Judah and had taken Beth-shemesh and Aijalon and Cederoth and Soco and Timnah, with their daughter towns, and dwelt in them."[4] From other directions as well came uninvited foreigners to possess the more desirable areas of the west-Jordan region, and always from the desert the nomads pushed in, as they have done in every century and are doing today. All this intrusion of foreign elements added to the interfusion of population and reduced the proportion of Hebrew blood. It must not be forgotten, as well, that Hezekiah, conscious that after the fall of Samaria the people of the north had little opportunity for the worship of Jahveh the God of their fathers, sent invitations "to the remnant that had escaped out of the hand of the kings of Assyria" to come to Jerusalem and celebrate the passover. Many responded, writes the Chronicler, though others scorned the message.[5] A hospitable attitude of this sort on the part of Judah would naturally induce some of the visitors to become residents of the land. The custom of going up to Jerusalem for the sacrifices continued until the fall of the city.[6] Moreover Hezekiah took the first effective steps to suppress the worship in the country sanctuaries both south and north,[7] an enterprise which culminated later in the Deuteronomic legislation and the reforms of Josiah.

---

[3] Jeremiah, chapts. 11, 12; 29:10.

[4] 2 Chron. 28:17, 18.

[5] 2 Chron. 30:1–11.

The severest blow dealt Judah in these years was the compaign of Sennacherib, in 701 B.C. and the devastation wrought by his forces. That Jerusalem was not taken and that some mysterious misfortune befell the Assyrian army is the favorable side of the story given by the Hebrew historian, who brings into striking prominence the heroism and statesmanship of the prophet Isaiah.[8] But the prism of Sennacherib gives the Assyrian account, in which the king claims that he took forty-six walled cities with their suburbs and more than two hundred thousand captives. The former Philistine cities of Ekron, Ashdod and Gath had to be given up. The royal harem was taken to Nineveh, and the tribute of the land was increased by a levy of thirty talents of gold, eight hundred of silver, precious stones, ivory, costly woods and metal tools.[9] Allowing for all probable exaggeration in the royal narrative the situation was sufficiently desperate. The picture drawn in the first chapter of Isaiah might well be that of the stricken land. The event was symptomatic of the unsteadiness of government in Judah, pulled this way and that by Egyptian and Assyrian lobbies, and paying the price of successive attempts to escape the foreign yoke.

---

[6] Jer. 41:5.

[7] 2 Kings 18:4; 2 Chron. 31:1.

[8] 2 Kings 18:13–19: 37; 2 Chron. 32:1–23; Isaiah, chapts. 36, 37.

[9] Olmstead, *History of Assyria,* pp. 305, 306; Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible,* pp. 372, 373.

The long reign of Manasseh witnessed a deliberate departure from all the ideals of the prophets of Jahveh, and the cultivation of relations both political and religious with the paganisms of the east. In such a time the tendency toward cosmopolitanism became more pronounced than ever, and there were few checks to intercourse, commercial, social and religious, with the outside world. This situation could not fail to alarm the men of priestly and prophetic type who felt themselves in any manner charged with responsibility for the faith and morals of the people, especially in regard to idolatrous practices and intermarriages with neighboring tribes. The remedy lay in some reshaping of the national institutes on more stringent lines, with explicit prohibition of worship at the provincial sanctuaries and of the admission of foreigners into the families and worship of Judah, and other needed statutes. Hence came the Deuteronomic code, prepared apparently in these dark days when all preaching of the national faith was suppressed, and the only hope lay in an appeal to the next administration. The temple was the fitting place of deposit for such a restatement of the law, and there it was found after the long nightmare of the reigns of Manasseh and Amon was over.[10] All the more disheartening was the situation in view of the apparent popularity of Manasseh and his heathenizing policies. The prophets were loud in their protests, but like other rulers whose conduct exasperated the prophetic party, Manasseh seems to have been regarded with general favor. Later generations also took a generous view of his reign, as is shown by the Chronicler's record of his summons to Babylon to explain his conduct, and his consequent amendment.[11]

---

[10] 2 Kings 22:8–10.

Josiah came to the throne too late to arrest more than temporarily the nation's descent to Avernus. His policies were wholesome, but the opportunity for Judah's salvation had passed. However sincere the effort to follow the discovery of the new code with vigorous reforms, it accomplished little.[12] Even if Jeremiah had been in sympathy with the covenant thus proclaimed, he could not prevail against the determined hostility of venial officials and a paganized populace. Like Hezekiah the king extended his reforming efforts to the mixed population of the north, which action probably brought fresh emigrants into Judah.[13] But all this accomplished only transient results. The reforms of Josiah failed as completely as did those of Akhenaten in Egypt. The death of the king in a foolish attempt to intervene in the Egypto-Assyrian controversy removed the only protector of the reformers, and left the state in the hands of weak or vicious men.[14] The laws against intermarriage were never enforced, there was growing intermixture between the native population and the strangers who took advantage of the lax government to secure holdings, and thus there was a gradual disappearance of racial distinctions.

If the Deuteronomic laws[15] could have been applied with vigor there might have grown up an effective resistence to denationalization. But it would seem that down to the days of Ezra there was no effort to hinder foreign marriages or to safeguard the Hebrew inheritance. Even the reformers themselves manifested no objection to the free incorporation of foreign elements into the population through conquest. In spite of general prohibitions, perhaps intended as a thrust at current pagan practices,[16] they explicitly state that the women and children of cities taken in war are to be counted as legitimate spoil and absorbed into the community.[17] There seems indeed to have been a degree of pride in the increase of the Hebrew population by all of these methods — natural growth, conquest and immigration. In this regard Israel resembled the growing American nation in the forties and fifties of the last century, when every shipload of immigrants was counted a matter of congratulation. If those immigrants who made their way into Palestine during these declining years had been of the same sturdy and purposeful character that Israel possessed at the beginning, or that those men exhibited who came in from many lands at the revival of Judah to lay the foundations of the new Jewish nation, the result might have been different and the commonwealth of Israel might have survived.

---

[11] 2 Chron. 33:11–13; cf. the *Prayer of Manasses,* in the *Apocrypha.*
[12] 2 Kings, chapts. 22, 23.
[13] 2 Kings 23:15–20; 2 Chron. 34:6.
[14] 2 Kings 24:29, 30; 2 Chron. 35:20–25.
[15] Deut. 7:1–6; 23:3–8; 25:17–19.

Not only was there a constant infiltration of neighboring and nomadic peoples into the land, but there were departures just as injurious to the integrity of Judah. The growing weakness of the state, the persecutions carried on both in the name of Jahvism and of the pagan faiths, the unhappy economic conditions that prevailed and the increasing fear of worse things to come led many of the people to seek refuge elsewhere. Slave raids and deportations in earlier days had done their work. Jeremiah makes it clear that at the time Jerusalem came to its end there were Hebrews living in Moab, Ammon and Edom who had been driven out from their homes and compelled to find asylum elsewhere. These returned at this time to salvage what they could of the abandoned fruits and other products of the land.[18] Poverty also must have led many who possessed courage and ambition to try their fortunes in other lands, and men of wealth would naturally feel apprehensive in the growing nervousness of the times, and seek a more secure place of residence. Many betook themselves to Egypt, as Hebrews had done for centuries, and were to continue to do in the evil days ahead.

---

[16] Deut. 7:1; 20:17; 23:3–8; and cf. McCown, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

[17] Deut. 20:10–14; 21:10–13.

The spirit of patriotism flared up briefly and sporadically as the end approached. The infatuation of rebellion against Babylon could not be cured by all the memories of tragic experiences in the past. The revolt of Jehoiakim in 597 B.C. brought swift punishment at the hands of Nebuchadrezzar. The warnings of Jeremiah against the futility of attempts at independence had no effect. The king of Judah had the good fortune to die before the blow fell, and the unfortunate son, Jehoiachin, received the chastisement deserved by his headstrong and spendthrift father. The Judean cities outside of Jerusalem were abandoned to their fate.[19] Egypt, to which Judah had so often looked for the help blandly promised in time of need, could or would do nothing, for Nebuchadrezzar held the entire territory of Palestine.[20]

[18] Jer. 40:11, 12.

[19] Jer. 13:17–19.

[20] 2 Kings 24:7.

Jerusalem was invested and taken. The royal family and all the more important officials, soldiers, and lesser citizens to the number of eighteen thousand were removed to Babylonia; at the same time the temple and palace were stripped of their treasures to make up the indemnity exacted.[21] To Jeremiah it seemed that Judah was completely carried away into captivity.[22] Jehoiachin remained a prisoner for many years in Babylon, though tradition affirmed that he was later treated with kindness.[23] In that same company, as tradition affirmed, went the young Ezekiel, to be the shepherd of a little colony of expatriates in the far land.[24] Thus was added one more to the long list of dispersions, deportations and plunderings which wasted the strength of both Israel and Judah and brought them successively to their doom.

In spite of the sense of ruin which fell upon the survivors of this catastrophe there was still a fairly numerous population remaining in the little state. The temple was left, though despoiled, and a false optimism was encouraged to the effect that the trouble would soon be past and the exiles would be allowed to return. This was the sentiment both in Judah and among the Hebrews taken to Babylonia. It manifested itself at home in excitement over a plan organized among the neighboring kingdoms of Ammon, Moab and Phoenicia to unite against the further encroachments of the king of Babylon. Against this mad design Jeremiah protested with all his power, and wrote urgently to the deported families in the east to adapt themselves to their situation, and avoid foolish notions of any early end of their exile.[25] Tradition reported that Ezekiel at Tel-abib on the Chebar river tried to show to his fellow Hebrews the reasons why their deportation was not the end but only the beginning of the misfortunes of a city as wicked as Jerusalem, and that its total destruction was imminent.[26] Indeed he insisted that Judah's sins exceeded those of apostate and devastated Israel, and that nothing short of its overthrow could satisfy the divine indignation.[27]

---

[21] 2 Kings 24:8–16.

[22] Jer. 13:19.

[23] 2 Kings 25:27–30.

[24] Ezek. 3:15.

That tragedy befell the city and its surviving population a few years later, in 586 B.C. Zedekiah, the last of the sons of Josiah, could not learn the lesson which all the contacts with Assyria and Babylonia should have taught, that rebellion was futile and certain to bring heavy punishment. Stirred up by the false prophets who were always the grief and despair of Jeremiah,[28] and encouraged by messages from the exiles and promises from Ammon and Tyre, a revolt was undertaken. It ran only a brief and fatal course. In a few weeks Nebuchadrezzar and his army camped about the doomed city, and after a year and a half of desperate defense it fell, and its homes, its market places, its palaces and its temple, the pride of every Hebrew heart, went up in flames. The unhappy king, blinded and childless, was taken with his family and court to Babylon, whither also went all the officers and leaders, and what seemed a great company of common people.[29] A remnant of the community rallied at Mizpah under a governor named Gedaliah, but soon afterward he was murdered by dissatisfied and ambitious revolutionaries, and many of those who had hoped to find some safety in the midst of these tragic events decided to take refuge in Egypt, whither so many of their brethren had gone in earlier years. They departed, taking with them the reluctant and protesting Jeremiah, whose last days were spent in the land of the Nile.[30]

---

[25] Jeremiah, chapts. 27, 29.

[26] Ezekiel, chapts. 8, 11.

[27] Ezekiel, chapts. 16, 23; cf. Jer. 3:11. Professor Torrey believes that Ezekiel's work lay in Jerusalem, not in Babylonia, and that the book in the present form is the product of a later age (*Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy,* chapts. IV, V).

[28] Jeremiah, chapt. 23.

[29] 2 Kings 24:18–25:21.

Thus came to an end the Hebrew state, and thus that fatal dispersion of the nation into many lands was given its latest and most violent impulse. There was of course a considerable population remaining in Judah. In spite of the strong language employed to describe the deportations, it is evident that the largest single group of Hebrews stayed in Palestine. They could do nothing else. They were without resources in the plundered land. They were defenseless against the neighboring tribes which crept in, covetous of the territory and rejoicing in the ruin of its capital. The total company of those who were taken to the east was large, though their numbers cannot even be estimated. They made up the second section of the dispersed people. Of these the larger number, after a period of homesickness and heartbreak, adjusted themselves to their new conditions, and were gradually absorbed into the resident population. They became reconciled to circumstances which they presently discovered were far more favorable than those of little Palestine. They had come to a country which touched with its trading interests all the lands, and whose cities were centers of incredible luxury and power. The gods of such lands they decided must be incomparably greater than the Jahveh whom their fathers had served. They lost the upward look to the hills from whence had come their strength, and acquired the outward look along the rich and promising highways of the world. They did not abandon their faith at once. In communities like that at Tel-abib, here and there in Mesopotamia, they probably continued for some generations to keep alive the memories of Zion, and some of these little centers furnished direction to the nascent Judaism that sprung up on the old soil. But the great majority of the people, like the exiles of the northern kingdom, were assimilated to the populations around them and absorbed into the life of Babylonia, Medea and Persia.

---

[30] 2 Kings 25:22–26; Jeremiah, chapts. 40–44.

The word "exile" has been used familiarly to designate this period of dispersion and the group of people who were taken from Palestine to Babylonia after the fall of the city. They were supposed to have returned after something more than a half century of absence. As a matter of fact there was no such period and no such return. The word "exile" as the designation of a period is a misnomer, and in reality has no value in a scientific study of the great dispersion. It represents only the patriotic beliefs, or at least the representations, of the Chronicler at a time so late that authentic records were unobtainable, and romance had secured the right of way. The Chronicler's narrative of the period from the fall of Jerusalem onward is as much of a romance as is the picture the book of Joshua gives of the original occupation of Canaan. It is written to support the view that the Hebrews in Babylonia, after the seventy years foretold by Jeremiah,[31] returned practically *en masse,* and reconstructed the city of Jerusalem and the province of Judah. This theory needs careful examination before it is adopted as the actual pattern of the facts. Fortunately, as in the case of the entrance into Canaan, we have other and far more nearly contemporary documents by means of which it may be checked. The prophets Haggai and Zachariah are the historical sources for this period. The problem here suggested will be discussed further on.

---

[31] Jer. 25:11; 29:10.

The Hebrews who took refuge in Egypt after the fall of Jerusalem constituted a third section of the people, if they were sufficiently aware of one another actually to form a community. The testimony of the book of Jeremiah is to the effect that the prophet when taken away from Judah found a group settled in lower Egypt, not far from the northern border.[32] There had been constant intercourse between Judah and Egypt since the days of Isaiah, and indeed the contacts covered a much longer period, as the stories of Solomon's Egyptian queen and Jeroboam's friendly relations with the Pharaoh of his day make clear. Hebrew mercenaries were employed in Egypt in the century before Jeremiah's time, and the Elephantine papyri make evident the fact that as early as 407 B.C. a Hebrew colony connected with an Egyptian fortress as far south as the first cataract had suffered an assault on the temple of Yahu by heathen priests, and was appealing to brethren in Palestine for aid to rebuild it.[33] Such a settlement must have been started sometime previously. The correspondence reveals no knowledge of the law of a central sanctuary, and apparently other gods shared with Yahu or Jahveh the regard of the worshipers. It is of course possible that these military colonists may have come from northern Israel after the fall of Samaria. The fact that they are called "Jews" implies merely that, like all other emigrants or refugees from Palestine, and in fact all the people of Judah in the post-Josian period, they were known by the name of the province with which they were associated. This was a geographical term, not a racial or a religious designation, and had only remote connection with the later Jewish race and its beliefs. What finally became of the community at Elephantine is not known. The cosmopolitan character indicated by the proper names would suggest that no particular regard was paid to racial exclusiveness. It probably met the fate of absorption which befell other groups. But in days when Judaism was growing to its full strength, the Egyptian Jews were a numerous body, a temple was built in Alexandria by Onias III in 170 B.C. and according to tradition stood for two and a half centuries. Literary contacts between Egypt and Palestine, as illustrated in the close resemblance of Psalm 104 to the Amarna "Hymn to Aton,"[34] the fact that the Septuagint was translated in Egypt, and that Philo, who shares with Ezra the honor of founding Judaism, lived there, give to that land still further significance in a study of Hebrew and Jewish history.

---

[32] Jer. 44:1.

[33] Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible,* pp. 387 ff. Price, *The Monuments and the Old Testament,* pp. 388 ff.

The period following the destruction of Jerusalem was marked by a large amount of literary activity among the Hebrews scattered in different parts of the orient, but chiefly among those in Babylonia. The collapse of the national institutions stimulated the production of such material as would preserve the story of the past. Much of course was lost in the confusion and terror of the time. The many references to the "chronicles of the kings of Israel" and of Judah in the books of Samuel and Kings are tantalizing hints of the amount of historical and other material that was accessible to the writers of these books but is no longer available.[35] Probably the Samuel-Kings prophetic records, originally one work, were among the first to take form after the dispersion. They seem to have been written somewhere in the east [36] and they bring the narrative down to the overthrow of Jerusalem and add one incident of thirty years later. There were psalms and proverbs which began to be gathered into collections, and the code of Deuteronomy, which was the law of Judah from the days of Josiah, no doubt received fresh study and commentation in groups of the dispersed Israelites. All writings of this character that helped to keep alive the memories of the past were cherished with added affection now that the nation was no more.

---

[34] Breasted, *History of Egypt*, pp. 371–6.

To all the Hebrews of that generation, as to those of former times, came the problem of deciding between loyalty to the institutes and ideals of their fathers, and adoption of the customs and beliefs of the people among whom they were scattered. The first was naturally the impulse of the more devoted. It was that impulse and the exhortations they received from prophetic and priestly leaders among them that kept alive the Hebrew spirit in some of these separated communities. These were the rare souls who regarded

[35] Willett, *The Bible Through the Centuries,* pp. 17, 24, 35, 242.

[36] Cf. 1 Kings 4:24 (Heb. "beyond the river"), and the Babylonian reckoning of 2 Kings 25:27.

themselves as custodians and trustees of the national traditions.[37] The second was the easier and the more common course. Why should they retain their loyalty to a kingdom that was no more and a God who had apparently left them to their own fate? Such a God must either be impotent or indifferent. In either case it was easy, after the first anguish of the tragedy was over, to adjust themselves to the life about them, which in most cases held all the lure of heathen practices and idolatries. Had it not been for the extraordinary heroism of certain devoted leaders, priests and prophets, it is difficult to believe that there could have been any survival. As it was, that survival of faithful ones diminished with the years and ultimately perished or took other forms. With the destruction of the temple the priestly ministries became impossible. Sacrifice and pilgrimage were abandoned. The practice of prayer, fasting, Sabbath observance, and even circumcision, all of which were made an obligatory part of the later Judaism, were observed, if at all, in a languid and half-hearted way. Indeed the writers of the Priest Code insisted that the Sabbath had never been kept by the nation, and that this was the chief cause of the eclipse of its life. It must pay for the neglected Sabbaths of past generations.[38]

Meantime Palestine was increasingly given over to the stranger. The northern section was populated by a mixture of Hebrew and heathen life which took the place of the kingdom of Israel, with the possible exception of the persisting community of the Samaritans. Into the little territory that was formerly the kingdom of Judah eager adventurers from neighboring clans crept, covetous of the land and no longer in awe of Jerusalem.[39] Edomites made their way into the half-empty towns of the Negeb. From the trans-Jordan region came Ammonites and Moabites. From the sea-coast came Philistines; from the north came the peoples of Samaria and, as always, from the desert came in the nomads seeking a home on a more productive soil. The Hebrew contingent remaining in the land, though the most numerous group left from the national debacle, was at the same time the least resourceful. The decline and fall of Judah had left little on which to build hopes of any revival of the state. It was a time of almost complete extinction of the old life.

---

[37] Jeremiah, chapt. 24.

[38] Lev. 26:34, 35, 43; 2 Chron. 36:22.

The next few years are voiceless, unless one finds in the Psalms echoes of still deeper tragedies. The city of the fathers lay waste and its gates were burned with fire. The country was a desolation, as compared with its former prosperity. Ezekiel knew of conditions in Palestine, and his description of it is vivid. The nations have made Judah desolate on every side. They boast that the ancient heights are theirs. The cities are forsaken and are becoming a prey and a derision to those about them. The Edomites have appointed the land to themselves for a possession.[40] To all appearances the chapter of Israel's life was closed.

Yet the nation was not dead, for prophetic voices were heard in the east encouraging the scattered people to waken from their despair and claim the blessing of deliverance. Ezekiel, who spent the first years of his pastorate in breaking down the false expectations cherished by his fellow Hebrews turned his efforts, after the fall of the city and the collapse of hope, to the task of reviving courage and assuring them of an early renascence of their institutions. The land was to be swept clean of its heathen inhabitants. Israel was to be given a new spirit, and a holy city with a new temple was to replace the one that had fallen. On the basis of the codes of the past he constructed a law of priestly holiness, the ideal constitution of the coming restored community.[41] A few years later, when Cyrus the Great was already hovering on the frontiers of Babylonia, another prophet, unknown by name, delivered his heartening message to the surviving Hebrews in that land. He assured them that the time of their deliverance was at hand, that Jahveh was incomparably stronger than the gods of Babylon, and that the servant of Jahveh, the nation despised and broken, was yet to achieve its destiny in the redemption of Israel and the world.[42]

---

[39] Ezekiel, chapt. 25; 33: 24–29; chapt. 35.

[40] Ezekiel, chapt. 36.

Such anticipations of national revival were the prophetic theme of the time. They are confident in the oracles of Jeremiah; they are elaborated in the blue-prints of Ezekiel; they are redolent in the messages of the Second Isaiah. But these prophetic dreams were never realized; or were realized in a manner that would little have satisfied the longings of those few loyal souls who yet held to the national hope. They were in fact highly perplexing to men who lived in a later age, and tried to reconcile these large expectations with the depressing facts. The devices to which they were driven find an illustration in the scheme of "weeks" used by the author of Daniel.[43] In reality it was not from the east but from the soil of Palestine itself that the last heroic efforts of Judah's life took their rise.

---

[41] Ezekiel, chapts. 40–48.

[42] Isaiah, chapts. 40–55.

[43] Daniel, chapt. 9.

The summons of the prophets of the age fell upon inattentive ears. The theory that the expatriates from Palestine rose in a body and returned to the land of their fathers is as romantic and unfounded as many others that have been imposed upon biblical history. It is not tenable in the light of the facts freely spread on the records of the time. It is indeed the view proposed by the Chronicler centuries later, with his tendency to idealize the past and to trace all contemporary institutions to the ancient Hebrew life. But appeal must be taken from his theory to the facts to which he himself is witness, and to the testimony of the prophets who were participants in the actual events.

In 538 B.C. Cyrus the Great came to the throne of Babylon. Soon after he issued an edict permitting the various peoples of his realm to return to their former homes, and take with them their gods and other sacred objects. This was a reversal of the Assyrian and Babylonian policy of expatriation. The account of this matter given in the books of Nehemiah and Ezra, pendent to the books of Chronicles, implies that a special firman was granted the people of Judah living in Babylonia, that there was a spontaneous uprising of the Hebrew community with enthusiasm for a return to Palestine, that a company numbering more than forty thousand made the journey, and that those who did not go aided the departing pilgrims with gifts for the new temple to be erected in Jerusalem. This numerous company is said to have set forth under the leadership of a certain Sheshbazzar, presumably a descendant of the line of

David and an appointee of Cyrus to be governor of Judah. They took with them the sacred vessels carried away from Jerusalem at the time the temple was destroyed by Nebuchadrezzar.[44] Soon after another company made the journey under the direction of two leaders, Zerubbabel and Joshua. It may be that Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel were the same, or that the latter was a nephew of the former. In two sections of the Chronicler's appendices to his main work,[45] there is given a list of those who are supposed to have come from Babylonia to Jerusalem with these leaders.

But these lists are manifestly census reports of the total population of Judah at a very much later time. This is shown by several outstanding features of the dual enumeration. One is that the company of the returning people is said to have reached the incredible number of forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty; whereas the total population of Judah in the reign of Zedekiah could not have exceeded twenty-five thousand, as estimated by Guthe. Another is the alleged distribution of this great company in the various places where they had formerly dwelt. The statement is quite explicit: "These are the children of the province that went up out of the captivity of those that had been carried away whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away, and that returned unto Jerusalem and Judah *every one unto his city*."[46] A study of the list makes it clear that it included the total population of Judah at some date late enough for the people to have settled in the localities named, and established something of a community and family life. In other words it embraces the entire complex of people living in the province at the time when the Chronicler wrote, at least two centuries later.

---

[44] Ezra 1:1–11.

[45] Ezra, chapt. 2; Nehemiah, chapt. 7.

[46] Ezra 2:1; Neh. 7:6.

There is not the slightest evidence that a single person who was taken away to Babylonia at the time of the fall of the city ever returned, and there is every natural reason to doubt such a probability. But the clearest evidence is furnished by the Chronicler's list itself in its statement that those who arrived in Judah came with Zerubbabel, Joshua, Nehemiah, Azariah (evidently a variant of Ezra) and others who are named. Considering the fact that the work of Nehemiah and Ezra fell in a period at least a century later than that of Zerubbabel and Joshua, the statement resembles the naïve reports of some chroniclers of the crusades, to the effect that an army of knights went out to Palestine under the leadership of Godfrey, Raymond, Baldwin, Richard of England, Frederick Barbarossa and St. Louis of France in a concerted effort and a unified body, despite the fact that there were at least eight of these tragic adventures, and that they covered a period of at least two centuries. Even in these regards the parallel fails, for the crusades were veritable expeditions whose historic reality is a commonplace of European annals, whereas the so-called "return" of the Hebrews from the east seems to have been a romance of the later times. That there were groups of Hebrews who made their way to Judah in the years of its struggle to survive need not be doubted. Such intercourse between Palestine and the farther orient was not infrequent at any period, and patriotic interest in the land and its fortunes would have induced some at least to heed the urgent exhortations of prophets to go back and take part in the rehabilitation of Zion. But the appeals made by the Second Isaiah to his fellow exiles to return to Judah show their indifference to the enterprise.[47] They had taken Jeremiah's letter all too seriously! They were little concerned with Israel's historic mission to the nations. At best it was a desperate venture, demanding courage and sacrifice, a venture comparable to the most difficult of missionary enterprises in modern times.

The real impulse to undertake the reconstruction of the capital came not from the arrival of pilgrims from Babylonia but from within the little community of Judah. The more favorable attitude of the Persian empire under Cyrus may well have put heart into the survivors of the nation in the province. At least we are in possession of the testimony of two prophetic leaders who were contemporary with the events, and therefore competent witnesses. Under the influence of Haggai and Zechariah the shattered group in the land gathered a measure of courage and began to dream of a new beginning.[48] Already they were taking the name of "Jews" from their little territory around the site of the ruined Jerusalem. In the later books of the Old Testament the name is applied to the inhabitants of the old southern kingdom, who may well have borne it at any time subsequent to the fall of Samaria. In the later writings like Nehemiah, Ezra, Esther and Daniel it was used as referring to the Hebrews in other lands. It was a title derived from the locality, Judah, and not as yet from any unique religious significance. That later meaning arose from other considerations.

---

[47] Isa. 48:20, 21; 52:11, 12, etc.

[48] Ezra 5:1, 2; Haggai, chapts. 1, 2; Zechariah, chapts. 1–8 (the section of the book that relates to the ministry of the prophet).

The first efforts of the faithful in the province were directed toward the rebuilding of the temple. This was to them the symbol of the ancient institutions of Israel which they were endeavoring to revive. The coming of pilgrims from the east bearing vessels and gifts for the sanctuary must have given fresh stimulus to their enterprise, however few these pilgrims may have been. They brought with them two men who represented the old official life, Zerubbabel of the Davidic stock and Joshua, a priest. The hearts of the people in the little company were filled with a great hope. Had not all the prophets foretold the restoration of Israel, and its return from all the lands to which it had been scattered? Had not Isaiah promised that Jahveh would raise his hand to recover the remnant that remained of his people, from Assyria, from Egypt, from Pathros, from Ethiopia, from Elam, from Shinar, from Hamath and from the lands by the sea? Had he not assured them that the two sundered kingdoms of Israel and Judah should be once more united, and freed from jealousy and hostility they would swoop down on the shoulder of the Philistines on the west, and together they would plunder the children of the east, Ammon, Moab and Edom?[49] The oracles of Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah had circulated in the province and had filled the people with like hopes.[50] Poor and few as they were, they would begin the revival of Judah.

In the two short prophetic records which tell the story of this time some things are made clear. Beyond the refer-

[49] Isa. 11:11–14.

[50] Ezek. 37:15; Isa. 40:9–11; 48:20, 21.

ence to Zerubbabel and Joshua, who are accepted loyally as their official leaders, there is no reference to any arrivals from the east. It is the "remnant" that is constantly in the minds of these men, the people who have remained in the land, and are now its only hope. The time seems favorable, for the rule of the new king, Darius, has not yet been firmly established. There are ardent expectations that the Persian empire will collapse and Judah be left to itself. The two prophets are confident that these hopes will be realized. Meantime the temple must be rebuilt, and their words are directed to the sacrificial efforts that are required for that achievement. A beginning was made with the foundations of the sanctuary. We are dependent on the Chronicler for this portion of the story, and after his manner he invests it with the pomp and circumstance of priestly ritual. Where the altar had first been erected they now laid out the foundations for the new building. But even the Chronicler cannot suppress the fact that when the old men of the region who had seen the former temple in its glory looked upon the modest size and limited preparations for the new building, they wept aloud.[51] It took four years of unceasing effort on the part of Haggai and his colleague to secure the completion of the building. In fact the impoverished colony was hardly able to finish the project after twenty years from the first royal permission. In this and every other enterprise that was undertaken for the benefit of the city they seem to have had little help from the incompetent leaders, Zerubbabel and Joshua, to whom they endeavored consistently to maintain their loyalty.

[51] Ezra 3:1–13.

From that time onward there was a slow and rather discouraging growth of the city. The author of Daniel speaks of it as "troublous times."[52] Zerubbabel disappeared from the picture, and Persian governors had control. All hopes of independence vanished. The expectations of the prophets had not been realized, and had become increasingly impossible of realization. The city was unprotected, walls were out of the question, the people were few and disheartened, and even the temple was neglected. The Hebrew language was passing away. It gradually gave place to Aramaic in Palestine. As early as the time of Hezekiah the people of Jerusalem appear to have understood that commercial tongue, which later became the *lingua franca* of the entire near east.[53] Intermarriage with non-Hebrews was increasingly prevalent. The little anonymous fragment called "Malachi" is an eloquent commentary upon conditions in Jerusalem at some period after the days of the two prophets Haggai and Zechariah. These were years from which few voices have survived, unless they are to be found in certain of the Psalms and in fragments in the prophetic books. The only hint of time in Malachi is the reference to a recent calamity that had befallen Edom, perhaps an attack of desert tribes that drove the Edomites again and farther into the territories of Judah.[54] The conditions in Jerusalem were more than depressing. The temple service was slack in the hands of priests who were meagrely supported, and the gifts were so poor that no one would dare present them to the Persian governor. There were but few faithful ones who held out against the general decline. It appeared that nothing but a divine visitation could bring a better day.

---

[52] Dan. 9:25.

[53] 2 Kings 18:26; the Hebrew of the text is "the Aramaic language."

[54] Mal. 1:1–5.

This is the last view one has of Hebrew life in Palestine. It was but feebly connected with the great days of Israel and Judah. The scattered people of the covenant were increasingly remote from the sources of their national life in locality, in kinship and in religious interests. It was only in small and dispersed communities that the spirit of loyalty and devotion remained. Their great legacy of monotheism, of ethical passion and of obedience to the God of their fathers had been committed to a literature that was to survive their extinction and prove itself the seed of a new and larger monotheism, the prized possession alike of Jew, Christian and Moslem.

It is nothing to the discredit of any people that it should fulfill its historic mission and pass away. Many nations have gone that road. There is not a Hittite or Babylonian in the world today. A microscopic group of Copts claim a remote connection with the Egyptians. The modern Greek is a far cry, both as to racial stock and language, from the Greek of the days of Pericles. The race is a mixture of Macedonian, Balkan, Albanian and Turk, with a language which, though it still employs the ancient alphabet, is really a compound of Greek, Latin, Italian and Romance, Slav, Wallachian, Albanian, Turkish and Arabic.[55] The Roman race is supposed to be perpetuated in the modern Italians, and Mussolini has done his best to strengthen the belief. But from the time of the last of the emperors the Roman race completely disappeared, and the Latin tongue became the broken dialect of a mixed people, out of which the modern Italian speech was to grow, decadent in form, degenerate in strength, but renascent in a grace and beauty which the Latin never possessed. First the vast population of slaves brought in their civilized and barbarous words, Greek, Aramaic, Arabic, Celtic, German and Slav. Then the Goth came and filled all Italy with his rough language for a hundred years. The Latin of the Roman mass is the Latin of slaves and tradesmen in Rome between the first and the fifth centuries. Compare it with the Latin of Livy and Tacitus. It is not the same speech, and to read the one by no means implies an understanding of the other.[56] In spite of the fact that both Greeks and Latins have maintained a measure of continuity in racial tradition through the centuries, their lands have been swept by wave after wave of foreign population whose precipitates formed strata like those of buried cities. Far from preserving the classic blood and speech, Italy is today a complex of changed and changing peoples.

---

[55] "This race, which admirers of ancient Greece consider the descendants of Pericles are ethnically further removed from the ancient Greeks than modern Turks are from their Asiatic ancestry" — Halide Edib, *Turkey Faces West,* p. 58. Prof. Lybyer, in the Journal of International Relations, April 1922, p. 463, speaks of the Greeks of today as "a modern group of very mixed descent."

Similar is the break in the relation of Hebrews and Jews. Quite aside from his separate origin, the Jew had none even of the advantages of continuity of environment and speech which with all their altered circumstances the Greeks and Latins enjoyed. As will be seen later, for a few centuries only did he have a land he could call his own. The Hebrew language began to pass away as a living tongue with the fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians. In the lands of dispersion the local languages were adopted. There were those who kept alive the use of Hebrew for generations, out of veneration for the ideals of Israel, just as in modern days Jewish groups have revived the effort to speak and write the speech of the Old Testament. Greek widely spread by the conquests of Alexander became the common literary tongue of Jews as well as of other races. The Jews scattered throughout the world naturally took up the tongues of their environment. The most commonly used dialect for the past few centuries is the Yiddish, a name derived from Judah, but actually a composite language, partaking of elements of German, Russian and Spanish, with admixture of Hebrew and English, and written in the Aramaic alphabet which superseded the Hebrew.

---

[56] Cf. Crawford, F. M., *Ava Roma Immortalis,* p. 42.

It is no discredit to the Jew that he is not a Hebrew, or that he was able to hold a country of his own for only four and a half centuries. Few nations in the long range of history have done as well. In reality he has wrought the miracle of survival through later ages that would have seen the end of most peoples. He has passed through tragedies that would have overwhelmed less persistent and loyal races. He represents the universal element in humanity. He belongs to every land and his wide dispersion has given him a universality of character possessed by no other people. But most of all he has maintained his faith in the God of his love, in the scriptures which are the chief classics of his religion, and in the conviction that he has a mission to his own scattered tribes and to all the nations of the world.

V

THE RISE OF JUDAISM

There is no precise time that can be set as the end of Hebrew history and the beginning of Jewish institutions. It is sometimes suggested that the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. is a suitable date for this event. But it was not an event; it was a process. Hebrews were living in scattered communities both in Palestine and in the wider world many years after the destruction of the holy city; Hebrew writers were making their contributions to the literature of their people during some generations following that event, and Hebrews of priestly tradition were elaborating the laws of the nation on the lines traced by earlier prophets in hopes of a national revival. These groups and activities gradually faded out, surviving only in a few choice spirits and the literature, some of which has come to us in the documents of the Old Testament.

Of the beginnings of Judaism it is possible to speak with greater precision. The activities of the patriot Nehemiah and the priestly reformer Ezra furnish the conspicuous landmarks of that great new adventure which has contributed so notably to the spiritual culture of the world. Particularly in the energetic measures taken by the second of these leaders are found the origins of one of the most significant religious movements in history. The two processes went on together. As Hebrew life slowly declined and expired, the

Jewish enterprise took form. Meagre as were its earliest manifestations, and difficult as were the first stages of its development, it had within it the elements of a vitality and courage which were to overcome all obstacles and send it forth into areas never reached by the older faith. Like Christianity in later years, it took its inspiration from that older culture, though in a different manner. In that sense the Hebrew ideals came to fresh expression in the two daughter movements.

As will be seen, the very combination of elements that went to make up the Jewish people and Judaism were calculated to produce a virile and aggressive evolution both of racial stock and of cultural characteristics. This was of advantage. So far as stock inheritance was involved the Jews of the reviving Jerusalem owed little to the exhausted and impoverished population of Judah. Far less did they profit by any large increment of returning Hebrews from Egypt or the east. Many were expected, but few actually arrived. It was a new people, an amalgam of many races, but for that very reason capable of enthusiasms and initiatives impossible among a pallid and passionless citizenship. No group in history has ever utilized more completely the limited advantages it possessed in location and heritage to create a fresh and far-reaching complex of interests. There is no need to claim for the Jew a fictitious racial inheritance. He has ample honor of another sort. His contributions to world thinking and leadership have been sufficient to assure him a place in the sun. He does not require the borrowed glory of another race.

It is a misuse of terms to speak of the Hebrews of the

Old Testament as Jews, just as it is quite unhistorical to apply the term Hebrew to the modern Jew. It is true that some writers who deal with the religion of Israel speak of it as Judaism, and permit the term to describe the entire sweep of both Hebrew and Jewish history. And there are instances in which authors have described the writings of the Old Testament under the title of "Jewish literature." But these practices cannot be justified on any grounds of historical exactness. It would be as appropriate to speak of the English people of the times of Henry VIII as "Americans," as to describe the Hebrews of Isaiah's day as Jews. One might as well include the writings of the Elizabethan age in a work on "American Literature" as to speak of the Old Testament as a Jewish document. Similarly it would be more fitting to apply any one of the titles, English, Scotch, Irish, German or Italian to the average American of today than to speak of the modern Jew as a Hebrew. In the former instance there is some connection with all of these and other European peoples. In the latter there is only the most remote and legendary relationship. The fifth century B.C. witnessed the gradual ending of one chapter and the somewhat dramatic beginning of the other. The records are scanty and inadequate. So far as authentic testimony is concerned, one passes directly from the writings of Haggai and Zechariah in the days of Darius I to the personal memoirs of Nehemiah in the reign of Artaxerxes I, a century later. Meantime the dynasty of David had disappeared, Jerusalem had been the victim of fresh disasters, and Hebrew life had come to its end.

The literary records that have attempted most directly to deal with this transition, indeed to avoid the implication that there was any change, are the books of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, which are recognized as being a continuous work. The date of this writing must be as late as the days of Alexander the Great, as many of its characteristics and references show.[1] It appears to have a single editor or author, who has subjected his materials to the requirements of his theory of the history. That theory has as its basis the defense of the racial purity of the Jews of his day against all suspicions of mixed blood or any contamination from the non-Jewish populations around them; and the vindication of the true Israel in opposition to the dangerous pretensions of the Samaritans who claimed to be the lineal heritors of the Hebrews. In order to impress this reading of the history it is assumed by this author that the entire population of Judah was expatriated by Nebuchadrezzar after the fall of the city; that if it had not been for the considerable company of exiles who came back from Babylonia in the reign of Cyrus with Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel and Joshua, and in that of Artaxerxes with Ezra and Nehemiah, there would have been no revival and no Judah.[2]

---

[1] Josephus (*Ant.* 11, 8, 5) describes the meeting of Alexander and Jaddua, the highpriest (Neh. 12:10, 11); notice such features in the document as: "King of Assyria," Ezra 6:22; "Cyrus, King of Persia," Ezra 1:1; "Darius the Persian," referred to as belonging to the distant past, Neh. 12:22; references to Nehemiah and Ezra as living in an earlier period, Neh. 12:26; mention of the daric as a current coin, 1 Chron. 29:7; the six (some commentators count eleven) generations after Zerubbabel, 1 Chron. 3:19–24.

[2] It will be noticed that Haggai and Zechariah make no mention of any "return" of importance, and further that the number of those whom the Chronicler describes as having "returned," nearly fifty thousand, was far greater than the total population of Judah before the fall of Jerusalem, or the number after Nehemiah's reforms, which might fairly be placed at ten thousand. Furthermore, such a population was far more numerous than the devastated land could support.

According to his theory the rebuilding of the walls was begun by Ezra and finished by Nehemiah,[3] thus putting these two leaders in the order which he regards as necessary to maintain the priority of the priestly over the lay element in the entire enterprise. In his view the law of Moses, unchanged from its original form as given by the lawgiver, was the norm of teaching and conduct among all Hebrews everywhere, and only needed to be enforced in the reviving but uninstructed Judah by some recognized authority. This was Ezra's major function. In a word, the chief object of the Chronicler was to insist that the Jewish community of his day in Jerusalem somewhere in the fourth century B.C. was continuous in its racial integrity and its legal interests with the Israel of classic times. For this reason the work of Zerubbabel as the restorer of Jerusalem and the temple is idealized; Jahveh has returned to the temple built by this leader, the city has been purified and the hopes of the prophets are in process of realization.

The interests of the Chronicler were with the priestly and Levitical ministries of the nascent state. There is probability in the view that he was of Levite stock, and perhaps belonged to one of the temple groups of singers. The emphasis placed by him on the ritual of worship from the days of David onward is proof of this interest. Throughout his narrative, which like all good histories begins at creation, he reveals his constant concern for genealogical traditions and lists, and for the liturgical features of Hebrew life.[4]

---

[3] Ezra 9:9; Neh. 6:15. But it is clear from Nehemiah's account that no earlier attempt had been made to rebuild the walls of the city (Cf. Neh. 2:13, 18).

[4] Note the prominence of priests and Levites in 1 Chron. 6:1–3 as contrasted with 2 Sam. 6:1, 2; in 1 Chron. 15:1–18; cf. 2 Sam. 6:12–15; and the

In those sections of his work which are parallel to the Samuel-Kings records the chief points of difference are instances in which kings exhibited their devotion to the law and were prospered in consequence, or disregarded it and were punished.

The northern tribes are hardly included in the purview of the work, since they are regarded as apostate, defiled and extinct. They are no more significant than Moab or Edom. "Jahveh is not with Israel," is the oracle to Judah.[5] The temple and Jerusalem are the objects of supreme divine solicitude. The elaborate genealogies of the first nine chapters of the work, which cover the time from Adam to Saul and David, and the two elaborate lists of names in the sections now separated from the main document under the names of Ezra and Nehemiah, disclose the unfailing interest of the writer in that order of material and his desire not only to utilize but to devise testimony of this sort. Even a casual examination of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah makes clear the introduction of such material wherever it can be worked in. The author was either closely connected with circles in which genealogical researches were pursued with enthusiasm, or he engaged in the activity for his own satisfaction. The Chronicler's style is marked by late characteristics, Aramaic affinities and systematic exaggerations of numbers such as suggest that it is one of the latest documents of the Old Testament.[6]

---

lists, genealogical and geographical, in 1 Chronicles, chapts. 1–9, 25, 28; Ezra, chapts. 8, 10; Nehemiah, chapts. 10, 11, 12; and especially the great duplicate census list in Ezra, chapt. 2 and Nehemiah, chapt. 7.

[5] 2 Chron. 25:7.

[6] While keeping in mind the Chronicler's main purpose, and his strong leaning toward the Levitical order, the reader will not fail to recognize the

The sources employed in the preparation of this work were primarily the Samuel-Kings documents of an earlier age. These were supplemented by other materials which are revealed by a comparison of this work with the older one, by the genealogical lists referred to, and by the material now embodied in Ezra-Nehemiah. In these later portions certain sections are in Aramaic,[7] a characteristic which is likewise found in the late apocalypse of Daniel. Moreover some parts of this material purport to be personal memoirs of the two men, Nehemiah and Ezra.[8] The portion ascribed to the former appears to be authentic, a real journal of the great patriot. The part in which Ezra is represented as speaking in the first person bears no such marks of authenticity, but seems to be for the most part if not completely the work of the Chronicler himself. Furthermore, the material of the two sections shows signs of confused dates when compared with Haggai and Zechariah chapters 1–8, and also of dislocation from its original order. Careful study of the data has led many modern scholars to the conviction that the work of Nehemiah preceded that of Ezra and to a considerable degree laid the foundation for it.[9] The natural predilection of the Chronicler for the priestly order may have led him to present the material in this sequence, or it may have been merely the result of dislocation of the writ-

---

independent character and value of many of the facts recorded by him. In not a few instances he has included material not found in the earlier records of Samuel-Kings, material which appears to be authentic and valuable. For instances, see the introductions and commentaries.

[7] Ezra 4:8–6: 18; 7:12–26.

[8] Of Nehemiah, Neh. 1:1–7:5a; 13:4–31; of Ezra, Ezra 7:27–8:34.

[9] E.g. Bertholet, Buhl, Cheyne, Guthe, Van Hoonacker, Jahn, Kennett, Kent, Kosters, Marqart, Torrey, Wildeboer, etc.

ings. In any event the rearrangement of the documents in logical and chronological order is one of the intricate and difficult problems of criticism, and has led to many varied conclusions. But the main lines of the author's interest and method are evident.

It was in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I (465-425 B.C.),[10] that Nehemiah, chamberlain and friend of the king, received a visit from a group of men from Judah among whom was a kinsman of his own. They brought a distressing story of conditions in the province. The people were few in numbers, the remnant that had escaped the general dispersion. They were in great reproach and affliction. The temple service was at the lowest ebb, or had been completely abandoned. The walls of the city were in ruins, as left by Nebuchadrezzar or by some later destroyer. The gates were burned. The population was a mixture of many clans, fragments of Hebrew and non-Hebrew families that had found refuge in the ruined city or its vicinity, but had little hope or courage. Naturally there was slight care for the national memories and traditions of Israel. Intermarriage was common, and the distinctions between different orders and strata of the social and official sort had largely faded out. The province was under the control of a Persian pasha who exacted from the people as much tribute and as many perquisites as he could secure. The merchant and artisan classes were facing difficult days. If the people outside of Jerusalem enjoyed any superior economic conditions it must have been due to the opportunities which the soil and the pasturage afforded. The

[10] Neh. 1:1; 2:1.

life of Judah was like a candle whose flame had all but expired.

The Chronicler has somewhat disguised these desperate conditions prevailing at the time of Nehemiah's arrival. Ezra is his hero, and he not only affirms his prior arrival in Jerusalem, but assumes the revival of confidence that resulted from his energetic reforms. In reality nothing of the kind had occurred, and even the Chronicler discloses much of the despair that had fallen upon Judah. In this crisis the little band of devoted men presented their plea to Nehemiah who was doubtless the wealthiest and most influential man of their race. His acceptance of the responsibility thus laid upon him involved departure from the scene of his interests and authority, and a heroic and sacrificial effort to meet a situation which to him and his friends must have appeared desperate. This decision and his subsequent career as governor in the forlorn little province mark him out as one of the most devoted, heroic and efficient leaders in the long story of religion.

Arriving in Jerusalem in 445 B.C. on leave of absence from his duties at Susa, Nehemiah made a personal and private inspection of the ruined walls and decided that the first thing to be done was to rebuild them.[11] He had none of Zechariah's confidence that Jahveh was a sufficient protection for the city, or that its population was soon to be so great that no set of walls could contain it.[12] The imperative need of the city was inhabitants. The present weak and discouraged group living there gave no basis for a true revival of the place. Its people must come from the east, whence he himself had come. He knew that there were scattered Hebrews in various parts of Babylonia and Persia. Perhaps they could be induced to migrate to Judah and take up the missionary task of its rehabilitation. So all the prophets had believed. But the people would not be attracted to a defenseless city. Walls were the first necessity. To the citizens and their leaders accordingly he made his appeal, and roused by the words and example of their governor they gave their assent to the plan.

---

[11] Neh. 2:11-16.

[12] Zech. 2:1-5; 8:4, 5.

Yet there was little enthusiasm over the project. Almost a century before the temple had been rebuilt after twenty years of struggle, and what had been the advantage? None of the promises so confidently made by Haggai and Zechariah had come to realization. The community was poorer and less numerous now than then, and the services of the sanctuary had become a burden and a mockery. Moreover at the time it was built they had received help from outside. There is no hint in the authentic records of that earlier period that there was any opposition from the Samaritans or any other group. Indeed it was the confident hope of Zechariah that people from many nations would join themselves to Judah in its growth and entreat the favor of Jahveh.[13] Now however the situation was different. The people were not enthusiastic, and outside there were bitter opponents of the attempt to fortify the city. A temple was not a menace; but walls meant a rival and a threat.

The Chronicler has indicated that the opposition to the building enterprise covered the entire period from the days of Cyrus and Zerubbabel; but there are difficulties in this view. There is no doubt however that the purposes of Nehemiah aroused instant antagonism. Sanballat of Beth-horon, a grandson of the Sanballat of the Elephantine papyri, Tobiah an Ammonite, and Geshmu an Arab or Edomite, were the chief adversaries.[14] To make matters more serious, they were related to families in Jerusalem, in accordance with the common practice of intermarriage. Naturally their friends and relatives in the city shared their views regarding the difficulty and futility of erecting walls. It was only the indomitable courage and energy of Nehemiah that prevailed over these adversaries and discouragements, and in the almost incredible space of fifty-two days the walls were finished. The narrative of the actual work on the walls, with the list of the classes and guilds who assisted, and their locations,[15] is valuable as an archaeological record of the topography of Jerusalem in the Chronicler's time, but hardly a valid index of the population in Nehemiah's day.

---

[13] Zech. 2:11; 8:21.

It is stated in the source that Nehemiah remained in Jerusalem for twelve years, then returned to the court in Persia, and once more came to Judah.[16] There are difficulties in accepting this version of the matter, and there is also the question as to whether the reforms he put in operation belonged to his first or his second residence in the province. It is perhaps unimportant to attempt complete and satisfactory arrangement of the dates. It is highly probable however that without delay he undertook some radical improvements in the situation. The population of the city was much too small to utilize its new opportunities or to afford it protection. With masterful resolution he ordered one in ten of the people of the province to come into the city to live.[17] Proper steps were taken to guard the gates against surprise.[18] Taxes were levied for the support of the temple and its ministries, and its apartments were cleared of the belongings of those who had no rights there.[19] Rules were made for the proper observance of the Sabbath, and other reforms in priestly behavior were set in motion.[20]

---

[14] Neh. 2:19; 4:1; 6:1; 13:28.

[15] Nehemiah, chapt. 12.

[16] Neh. 2:1–11; 13:6, 7.

But most of all, the governor was disquieted by the mixed character of the population of the city.[21] Apparently no efforts had been made to prevent intermarriage with Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Samaritans, Philistines and the other neighboring peoples. Of course this practice had always met the disapproval of the leaders of Israel in the days of Hebrew nationality, as a matter of public policy and good form. But even the laws of Deuteronomy, which seemed sufficiently explicit and drastic, were weakened by notable limitations, and as a matter of fact were never taken seriously. The prophet whose work is known under the title of Malachi reproved the people for the practice of mixed marriages, but apparently largely because of the injustice to Hebrew women involved in the custom. In reality there never was any serious effort to preserve untainted the blood either of Israel as a whole or of Judah after the dispersion. But that event led to reflection regarding the danger of total extinction of the race. That danger was already past remedy, but at least some attempts at reform were pos-

[17] Neh. 11:1.

[18] Neh. 7:1–4.

[19] Neh. 13:4–9.

[20] Neh. 13:4–9, 28.

[21] Neh. 13:23–28.

sible, and Nehemiah used his undoubted authority to bring about a better state of affairs. He observed that the children of these mixed marriages were speaking a patois which was not the Aramaic of Judah, but a jargon of tongues. The measures employed by him to enforce his reforms seem forcible enough to have accomplished their purpose. If cursing men, plucking out their hair and chasing them out of the place could not bring results, what could? In reality nothing could, and nothing did. The experience of Ezra soon afterward makes that clear.

In what manner the work of the two reformers was connected, if at all, it is impossible to determine. Neither alludes to the other in any definite manner. Yet their activities fell in the same general period, and their objectives were similar. Nehemiah reconstructed the civic life of Jerusalem, and Ezra gave it a new constitution and cultus. Did the latter arrive during the absence of Nehemiah in Persia? In any event it is easy to perceive that such a beginning as had been made by the devoted and generous governor was a necessary prelude to the reforms of Ezra. It is possible that the latter arrived during the interval between the two periods of Nehemiah's residence in Jerusalem, or that he came at the time of the governor's return to the province. The record states that his mission occurred in the seventh year of Artaxerxes,[22] presumably the second of that name (404–357 B.C.), which would date the event in the year 397 B.C. His motive in taking up the task was his zeal to bring to the reviving community the revised and elaborate law on which he and others of his race in the east had been devotedly laboring.

[22] Ezra 7:7.

In that circle of earnest students of the older laws and the new occasion was the promise of the coming Judaism.

Like others of his group, survivors of the Hebrew line, Ezra, a scribe, the first of the order, and represented by the Chronicler as of priestly descent, "had set his heart to seek the law of Jahveh and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments."[23] That his circle in Babylon had given itself to the expansion of the older codes, the Book of the Covenant, Deuteronomy, Ezekiel's ideal constitution and the Law of Holiness, seems clear from the result of the movement. From Ezra's point of view all the work done thus far in the rehabilitation of Jerusalem was of little value unless it was to be followed up with a vigorous campaign of indoctrination in the new Priest Law that had taken form under his hand.[24] The genealogy of Ezra as recorded by the Chronicler runs back to Aaron in fifteen generations.[25] This may be an attempt at a valid record, or it may be devised in accordance with others of the writer's genealogical lists to serve the purpose of his theory. In any case the priestly interest of the entire transaction is evident. The situation in Judah was ominous, less because of any material or economic difficulties than by reason of its sinister contamination by foreign elements, its almost total loss of the old Hebrew inheritance and its ignorance and disregard of the Torah. In fact the situation was much worse than Ezra imagined, as he was to discover to his horror on his arrival.

According to the Chronicler's report, the first concern of the reformer was to secure as large a company of priestly and Levitical companions as possible to assist in the enter-

[23] Ezra 7:10.
[24] Ezra 9:8.
[25] Ezra 7:1–5.

prise, and some fifteen hundred were induced to make the journey.[26] This generous number and the meticulous care with which their genealogies are traced subject the narrative to the same reserves of judgment which are needed in the other statements of the work. Are these authentic facts, or are they a part of the romance of the movement? The same question arises regarding the firman issued by the king to Ezra and his company.[27] Its Hebrew point of view and phraseology are at once apparent. But its purpose is clear. Ezra was represented as commissioned to proceed to Jerusalem with any who were minded to go with him, particularly priests and Levites, to ascertain whether the people of the province were living in conformity to the law of God which he was taking with him, and to teach them the requirements of that law. This point is made clear by reiteration. Twice the expression occurs, "the law of thy God which is in thy hand."[28] His passport therefore committed him to the important duties of bringing Judah to the test of the new law, of more fully interpreting and enforcing it, and of delivering the gifts which the king and those who were in sympathy with the mission had contributed. Thus provided, Ezra and his friends, probably not a numerous company, arrived in Jerusalem.

That he had but a slight opinion of the population of the city, either as to numbers or quality, is clear. They were a mere remnant, a fragment broken from the fabric of Israel, a solitary nail left in a wall. In fact they were a different people, the result of incessant intermingling of races. If some man of the old stock could have survived for gen-

[26] Ezra 8:1–20.

[27] Ezra 7:11–26.

[28] Ezra 7:14, 25.

erations, like the Wandering Jew of later legend, he could have recounted the story of inevitable and ruthless change, a story

> "Told when the man was no more than a voice,
> In the white winter of his age, to those
> With whom he dwelt, new faces, other minds."

The only hope for Hebrew institutions was the rescue of the Torah from oblivion, the summoning of the twelve tribes, still ideally existent, from the far places of their dispersion to join in the revival of Jerusalem, the enrichment of the neglected temple service until it should be a joy and not a burden, the substitution of a worshiping congregation for the vanished nation, and the creation of a community strictly obedient to the divine law. A people thus consecrated to the holy memories and statutes of ancient Israel as symbolized in the Temple and the Torah, the Building and the Book, might survive and fulfill the mission which classic Israel attempted and failed to achieve.

Strict conformity to the law informed with many rules of conduct might be far less attractive than the older free and easy behavior of a people who had refused to listen to the great moral leaders of the past. Yet that way alone lay survival and a mission. And Ezra and his fellow reformers were not mistaken. By their untiring efforts Judaism came to its birth. Their hopes for a return of the Hebrews from distant lands were never realized, but in the little community itself with all its limitations there was formed the center or kernel of a new Israel which came to think of itself as worthy to inherit the promises made to the

Hebrew fathers.[29] Externally a mixture and internally disunited, they took fresh root on the old soil and ultimately came to vigorous life. The very hardness of the discipline prescribed for the new community as the basis of its organization gave it a protecting shell of exclusiveness and loyalty which carried it through the distresses of Maccabean and Roman days.

The first experiences of Ezra and his friends in the province were little in accord with his expectations. He had brought with him the new Priest Code, in compliance with which the peace and prosperity of Jerusalem were to be secured. But he took for granted the observance of the ordinary rules of good conduct as taught by the lawgivers and prophets of the classic age. Among such requirements was the avoidance of intermarriage with other peoples. That was the very foundation of a separate and elect community. What then was his astonishment and alarm when he discovered that no such obligations were recognized in the province, but that intermarriage was freely practiced with all the neighboring peoples. Even "the priests and the Levites had not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands, doing according to their abominations, even of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians and the Amorites. For they had taken of their daughters for themselves and for their sons, so that the holy seed had mingled themselves with the peoples of the lands; indeed the hand of the princes and deputies had been chief in this trespass."[30] This of course was a long bow to draw, for several of these national

[29] Deut. 28:1–14.

[30] Ezra 9:1, 2.

groups had vanished from history centuries before. But the words were not too strong to describe what to Ezra seemed the unspeakable horror of the situation. "When I heard this thing I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and sat down astonished."[31] Things could hardly be worse.

Nothing is more evident proof of the miscellaneous and intermingled character of the community than the shocked surprise with which the people beheld the amazement and agony of the missionary from Babylon. Humbled and terrified by these demonstrations of grief on the part of the man who purported to represent the divine will for the province, the population through its leaders confessed its errors, and promised any amendment which might be prescribed. A commission was appointed to examine the situation and decide on a course of procedure. As a result, the Chronicler states, a drastic rule was adopted that all the foreign-born wives and their children should be sent away, and after his manner, a long list is appended of those men both priests and laymen who swore to take this step, and who offered a guilt offering in token of their penitence.[32] No record is given of the results of this sudden and peremptory measure. It was manifestly impossible to enforce it, and after the first gestures of compliance induced by the excitement of the hour, it lapsed into disuse. The moral sense of any community would have revolted at so violent and unjust a step. Is the failure of the effort the reason for even the Chronicler's silence regarding the fate of the undertaking? No doubt it would have been an embarrassment to acknowledge its collapse. Or is the entire account of the dramatic episode and its results apocryphal? Whatever may be the impression produced by the narrative, it is quite in harmony with the Chronicler's theory of a continuing and uncontaminated Israel.

---

[31] Ezra 9:3.

[32] Ezra, chapt. 10. The parallel account in 1 Esdras 9:36 says they actually sent the wives and children away.

The next step recorded is the calling of an assembly, a mass-meeting of the people of the city, at which time Ezra and his colleagues read the "book of the law of Moses," the document which he had brought from the east.[33] This was the Priest Code, which was now to become the constitution of the revived state. When this had been read in this public gathering it was accepted by the people and their leaders and sworn to as the law of the community. As the assembly gathered by Josiah adopted the Deuteronomic code as the basis of the reformed commonwealth and recognized it as canonical scripture,[34] so the Priestly Law and its Pentateuchal setting became the foundation for the Jewish state begun by Ezra on this impressive occasion. Its acceptance by the entire Palestinian community which held to the worship of Jahveh is shown by the fact that even the Samaritans took it over as authentic Mosaic writings to be held with the remainder of the Five Rolls out of all the Hebrew literature as holy scripture.

There followed naturally the observance of the various features of the new code, many of which had their roots in the older legislation. The feast of Tabernacles was kept; the Sabbath, so long neglected, was now given fresh and emphatic attention; the seventh year was recognized as a

[33] Nehemiah, chapts. 8–10.

[34] 2 Kings 23:1–3.

time for the remission of debts; the law of the tithe for the support of the temple service was enforced; the offerings for the sanctuary, first fruits, meal, burnt offerings, and wood for the sacrifices, and the new rule designating a poll-tax of a third of a shekel, were all set forth and given mandate authority. The feasts and festivals prescribed by the law were put on the calendar as obligations; and the stringent regulations regarding mixed marriages were made clear, particularly in the case of dangerous neighbors like the Ammonites and Moabites.

In this manner Judaism began its career. It was the appeal from an old and decayed nationalism to a fresh and hopeful religion. Political expectations and alliances were abandoned. It was an assembly of God-fearing men and women. It was made up of people of diverse groups but with a common purpose. Its members had turned from their heathenism or their half-hearted and diluted monotheism with a fierce enthusiasm for the faith in Jahveh with which their leaders had fired them. To all intents it was a new religion to which they were called, and with the devotion of proselytes in every age, they responded with eagerness. The old Hebrew race had vanished, and considering the later phases of its history there was little to regret in its going. The new race of Jews had come into being, bearing indeed a name associated at first with the territory of Judah, but soon becoming a title of vastly greater significance, and destined to send forth its confessors and its teachings into all the world. That it could not claim racial unity with the people of the Hebrew line was no disadvantage. It was made up of the purposeful and resolute souls who coveted not so much a political career as an ethical and religious experience. Under the spell of the enthusiasm created by the drastic reforms of Ezra they found what they sought.

It would seem that whatever may have been the periods of Nehemiah's residence in the province, he co-operated with his scribal colleague in all the measures adopted. The hopes of the two men were kindred. They carried over something of the Hebrew inheritance to the new community.[35] Their dream was that of a holy people in a holy land, from which the stranger was excluded, and in which all intermixture of blood and ideas would be impossible. The temple, the law, circumcision and the Sabbath were the symbols of this new commonwealth; and faith in God, prayer, fasting and the strict observance of the rules of conduct were to be the essentials of the holy life. It is not strange that from that modest but impassioned beginning there evolved a people that has become the wonder of history in its fidelity to the ideals that called it into being and that have guided its career.

It is evident that the impulses which started the new movement of Judaism were from Babylonia. However few in numbers the leaders in the enterprise may have been, they represented the best survival of the old Hebrew life. How many there may have been of this loyal type of Israelites remaining in the east it is impossible to say. In later days the Jews in Babylonia and Persia were very numerous. They were the result of a combination of the survivals from the past, of pilgrims migrating from Judah to the more favorable environment of the east, and of accretions from the population around them, attracted by the principles of Judaism. How far the resemblances between Jewish and Zoroastrian beliefs facilitated such adhesions it is of course impossible to conjecture. Certainly the Persian religion professed by Cyrus and his successors and widely held by the people of that land was far nearer to the beliefs of the new Jewish group than any of the other systems prevailing in the world of that age. Many parallels have been noted between the later Judaism of the days of Jesus and the teachings of Mazdaism as enunciated by the prophet of Persia.[36]

---

[35] It is of interest to recall the high esteem in which Ezra was held by the Jews of later years. Some scholars indeed have doubted the entire Ezra tradition, and regarded it as the creation of the Chronicler. The genealogy given him in Ezra 7:1–5 is not long enough to reach back to Aaron. He is not included in the list of worthies named by the Son of Sirach (Ecclus. chapts. 44–50; especially is his absence noticeable in 49:11–13 where Zerubbabel, Joshua and Nehemiah are all named) nor by the author of 1 Maccabees (2:49–66) or the writer of Hebrews (chapt. 11). No later reference is made to the numerous body of companions mentioned as brought by Ezra from the east. He is represented as possessing considerable official authority on his arrival, and a large treasure. Yet he made no adequate use of either, and saw his work come well-nigh to failure. And was there ground for the claim to priestly rank (Ezra 7:1–5), even high priestly (1 Esdras 9:40, 49)? Yet around his name gathered an entire literature, of history, romance and apocalypse. According to tradition preserved in 2 (4) Esdras 14:19–48 (a work of about 100 A.D.) he dictated to his five companions the entire list of books of scripture, which had been burned, and the seventy secret books.

The influence of Egyptian refugees from Palestine upon the new enterprise growing up in Judah was small if indeed any is to be discovered. The people of this series of migrations to the south were less interested than their Babylonian contemporaries in events taking place in the old Hebrew territory. As has been observed, the total number of Hebrews who made their way into Egypt at different periods of the history was large. Some of them fled from troubles at home, and others were lured away by opportunities for trade or for military service. The group at Elephantine with its temple to Yahu may not have been the only garrison community. The interest of the Egyptian dispersion in the older life of their people was small. They appear to have known or cared little about the law of the Jerusalem sanctuary, and drifted easily into half or wholly idolatrous forms of worship. Their lax attitude toward the ritual of Israel would have angered Ezekiel, as their easy practice of mixed marriages would have shocked Ezra. In the more remote parts of Egypt such groups probably faded out into the general population. In lower Egypt however, perhaps due to constantly arriving Jews from Palestine, the Jewish group came to be sizable and important, with institutional, literary and religious activities that demand later consideration. But in this period of nascent Judaism the Egyptian contingent played little part in the adventure as compared with the Babylonian contribution. In a very true sense Babylon was the birthplace of Judaism.

---

[36] Carter, G. W., *Zoroastrianism and Judaism,* chapt. 2. Moulton, J. H., *Early Zoroastrianism,* lecture 9.

The Jewish community in Jerusalem which resulted from the devoted labors of Nehemiah and the enthusiasm and zeal of Ezra had the usual type of organization which prevailed in most earlier Hebrew localities. There was of course the Persian governor, who was responsible for order and tribute in the province. The elders or " senior statesmen " held a position of respect and perhaps of some authority, though much of the old power vested in the elders of cities and towns in the former times had passed away. The real leadership of the city so far as social and religious life was concerned was in the hands of the priests. This order had developed rapidly in influence during the closing years of the monarchy, and in the beginnings of the Jewish state it was the chief factor left from the past. When Zerubbabel and Joshua came with pilgrims from the east in the days of Cyrus they represented respectively the monarchy and the priesthood, the state and the church. But the former lost out in the person of the prince, and the priest was left as the sole functionary. This plan, with the brief interlude of Nehemiah's governorship, was taken up by the new Jewish community, and became in an increasing degree the pattern of organization. A gradual development of a hierarchy took place, with varying orders, unknown in the Hebrew times, and the power of the state was finally absorbed in this order and its head, the high priest. In ancient Israel the king had on occasion performed the duties of priest,[37] as any study of the development of the priesthood will show. This was true of most oriental monarchies, and has been perpetuated in the history of many lands to the present time. The head of the state becomes by virtue of his office head of the church.[38] But in many instances the reverse has been true. The head of the church has assumed or secured the sovereignty of the state. This was the papal claim in more than one period of European history and has been renewed, even though in an extremely limited form, in the present day.[39] This was the change that took place in Judah. The priests became the actual rulers of the community from the days of Ezra onward, and the title to political power lay in the claim to a priestly lineage. The high priest was virtually king. Even the Maccabean rulers grounded their right to sovereignty not alone on their exploits but on the claim to a priestly genealogy.

---

[37] Cf. instances of this custom, cited on p. 168.

[38] England, Russia under the Czars, etc.

[39] Cf. the newly organized "Papal State."

The physiological connection between the new community and the old Hebrew life was small. As has been seen, the Hebrew element had grown less and less through the closing years of the Judean state, and had been replaced by constant accretions from the neighboring peoples who availed themselves of the downfall of Jerusalem and the ruin of Judah to secure a foothold on the soil. The community which Nehemiah found on his arrival was of the most complex sort, as even the Chronicler with his strong Jewish bias makes clear. The population was an amalgam of many racial groups among which the Hebrew had small place. The few who came from the east in the various pilgrimages after the decree of Cyrus and with the reformers in the days of the Artaxerxes cannot have been sufficient to overcome the strong preponderance of non-Hebrew blood in the province. The result was that a new and vigorous type had taken the place of the old. This was fortunate. The men who made up the citizenship of the rebuilt Jerusalem were of the sort who were ready for the difficult adventure of erecting a community structure after the pattern with which their leaders had inspired them. History shows that such a mixed community has the initiative, vigor and efficiency which are rarely found in an old civilization. Such is the boast of America today,

> "Made of one blood with all on earth who dwell,
> Born brothers of the near and far as well;
> The children of one sacred fatherhood,
> And common heirs of universal good."

It was the moment for such a new race to appear. The old Egyptian, Asia Minor and Mesopotamian cultures had had their day, and all but ceased to be. Persia as a political power was waning, but as a factor in civilization was coming to its own. The rising forces of Greece and Rome were on the horizon. It was a time of opportunity for a new people and a new faith which should gather up the best of the past, and reinterpret it to the world. That was the open door which Providence set before the Jewish community in Jerusalem, the birthplace of the older monotheism, the cradle of a greater monotheism to come. Would Judaism be able to perform the service which mankind needed? Was there sufficient force and moral idealism in the new race now taking form to carry on this adventure? History is the answer.

In this movement the imperishable but threatened ideals of Hebrew prophets disengaged themselves from the crumbling chaos of the Hebrew state and were preserved for wider appropriation. Judaism rescued that heritage, and developed the religion of the Old Testament in its own characteristic manner through midrash and Talmud into the Judaism of later days. But that was not the only development. A divergent tendency already implicit in the new enterprise followed a different curve, and issued in Christianity. These two interpretations of the Hebrew spiritual culture produced the two monotheistic religions that have had most to do in shaping the ethical and spiritual ideals of the occident. They are two of the daughter faiths that have emerged from the ancient life of Israel. The third is Islam, embracing fragments of both, but furthest in spirit from the source from which it arose.

No proper description can be given of the racial and somatic elements that appeared in the Jewish race. Efforts have often been made to define the physiological characteristics of this people, both in the early period and at the present time. It cannot be done. There is a list of physical traits, such as prominent or broad nose, red or black hair, facial contour, height of skull, brow formation, and the like. Such features are doubtless all of them found in Jews in various parts of the world, but not in any persistent strain, and rarely combined. Moreover they are found equally among other races. It is often said that one can recognize a Jew at sight. If this be the case, which is doubtful, it is less because of appearance than by reason of speech or manner. "Race is in the last issue in large degree a matter of psychology, not in the sense that a particular group of psychical traits is inherited, but that 'races persist because the majority of men believe in them heartily, passionately, desperately.' Race is 'a unity which finds its origin in intellectual phenomena such as language, religion, custom, law and culture.'"[40] It is the belief of ethnologists that races like the Jews which have been forced to live among other peoples have inevitably taken on many of the physical characteristics of those among whom they live.[41]

Certainly there is no one type among Jews.[42] Resemblances can be found among them to many other racial groups. A favorite diversion has been the comparison of faces found on the monuments, Egyptian, Hittite, Assyrian, Babylonian, with Jewish faces of today, in the effort to trace resemblances. But this can be done in almost any part of the near east, where the mixture of stocks is beyond description. The common Jewish face of caricature is Hittite. The tradition of racial integrity and purity of blood among Jews is as much of a myth as in the case of the earlier Hebrews. Outside of small groups which have been able to live in seclusion for some generations such preservation of race unity has been impossible. Dispersion, absorption, persecution, outrage, violation, expatriation and intermarriage have had their way with this unfortunate people. Religious prejudice and racial traits have combined to make them unwelcome and unhappy wherever they have gone. Naturally they drew together for protection and reacted with hatred and fear against their oppressors, too often people professing the Christian religion. The stories of the pale and the ghetto are pathetic and accusing to all who read them and feel in any manner a creedal or racial involvement in them. In such circumstances it would be incredible that these people could maintain an unmixed and untainted racial stock.

---

[40] McCown, *The Genesis of the Social Gospel,* p. 100, quoting Todd, *Theories of Social Progress,* pp. 280, 283.

[41] Ripley, *Races of Europe.*

[42] Godbey, *op. cit.,* pp. 144, 145, 150, 151.

Nor have all Jews desired to keep to themselves. Deliberate departures from Judaism must have taken many ten thousands of them out from the limits of Jewry into gentile circles. In this manner they sought refuge from violence, or opportunities for military service, trade, or social emancipation. One of the most significant tokens of this fact is the deliberate and constant exchange of Jewish for non-Jewish names. This practice began as early as Roman days,[43] and has continued and increased through the centuries. Only a small percentage of the family names borne by Jews today have any genuine Jewish characteristics. They belong rather to the peoples among whom Jews have lived, Russians, Germans, Spaniards, Italians, French and English, and were often means of escape from political, commercial or social disadvantage.[44] The recruits from Judaism to certain forms of religious belief, Christian and otherwise, are an illustration of the process. Had it not been for these constant depletions of the Jewish ranks from many causes, their numbers would today surpass those of almost any of the races of Europe.

The composite nature of the Jewish commonwealth in Jerusalem at the beginning was continued and increased through succeeding years. As the new Jewish state grew in importance it attracted the attention and secured the allegiance of the people around it. That process of infiltration from all the neighboring lands and from the desert never ceased. The prophets in earlier days had counted confidently on such an income of population, and though the first hopes of the new community were fixed on people of like faith in the east, they welcomed any helpful immigration. They felt that men of every blood might be proud to call themselves members of the community.[45] Certainly there were many who felt and responded to that impulse. The desire was both territorial and religious. Newcomers came in from many motives. The Edomites, pushed out of their lands by the Nabateans, the makers of Petra, had come in numbers into southern Judah and made Hebron their chief city. Other people, the historic neighbors of Judah, swelled the population of Jerusalem and the province. But they came also to enjoy the religious values of the new community. The services of the temple, the moral idealism of the scriptures, now increasing in volume, and even the strictness of Jewish ritual and discipline were attractive in contrast with the superstitions and idolatries of paganism.

---

[43] *Transactions American Philological Association,* 1928, p. 215.

[44] There are examples of actual Hebrew words used as family names by Jews today such as Cohen (priest), which is often disguised in such forms as Cohan, Cohn, Cone, Cowen, Cahan, etc., or biblical names, adopted as family appellations, and often similarly modified, e.g. Levi, which has many variants, such as Levy, Levin, Lewi, Lewin, Lewis, etc. But most of the common Jewish names, such as Rothschild, Goldberg, Goldstein, Erbstein, Freiburg, etc., are of German and Russian origin, and represent deliberate efforts to escape the difficulties involved in bearing distinctively Jewish surnames. Note also the custom adopted by Jews to obliterate the marks of circumcision in the Maccabean times (1 Macc. 1:5; 1 Cor. 7:18).

There were dividing lines between conservatives and liberals, as there have been in every period. There were those who accepted literally the exclusive ideas of Nehemiah and Ezra, and were disturbed by the growing group of those who without warrant believed they had claim to Hebrew ancestry. They would view with alarm the growing inclination to allow all classes and races to share in the privileges of their cultus. On the other hand the majority was in no position to approve such group distinctions, and accepted the situation with satisfaction. Both these sections of the community persisted, and apparently the former grew in numbers and influence. In the days under consideration there must have been a large measure of devotion to the new law and its obligations. The adherents of a new faith are usually enthusiastic and devoted. Proselytes from any source naturally would share the conviction and zeal of the leaders. Such has generally been the case with proselytes. The newcomers were likely to be the strongest and most patriotic adherents of the new régime.

---

[45] Cf. Ex. 12:48 f.; Lev. 19:33, 4; Num. 9:14; Deut. 14:29, 16:11; Isa. 56:3, 6; Zech. 8:20–23.

The character of the growing Jewish community differed in a number of characteristics from the old life of the Hebrews. In spite of the frequent misfortunes to which the latter were subjected through their history the ancient Hebrews were on the whole a free and joyous people, living much in the open spaces, delighting in the beauty of their land and taking life with the care-free confidence of the unconcerned. Their vocations promoted this sentiment. As farmers, herdsmen, artisans, tradesmen, dwellers in city or village, they took the evil of life with the good, the bad seasons with the favorable, and were not scrupulous or apprehensive. The popular religion was conducive to this habit of mind. In spite of all prophetic warnings, Jahveh was regarded generally as the partisan of his people, whose favor was to be counted on in any crisis, and who was not exacting in his requirements. The priests and prophets of the ordinary type encouraged this attitude. The influence of the local sanctuaries tended strongly in the same direction. The pilgrimages and sacrificial feasts were times of merriment and good fellowship. Indeed it was this complaisant popular mood which caused the greater prophets their chief concern.

Quite different was the disposition of the new community of Judaism. Its people had undertaken a serious and dangerous adventure. They were the survivors of various political and economic disasters. They were a remnant spared from many clan and regional mischances, and were convinced that their safety lay only in scrupulous obedience to the will of the God regarding whom their leaders and their law instructed them. They were under few illusions regarding their political possibilities. Jerusalem's future must depend upon conformity to the rules of a consecrated life. However widely their children may have departed from these ideals in later years, this was the mood in which the little community of the revived Jerusalem began its career. It was a commonwealth of people committed to the observance of a law. The good will of their God was dependent upon compliance with that Torah. They belonged to a church rather than a state, and only in conformity with its ritual could they hope for prosperity. That ritual was composite. Some of it came from the old temple service, some of it from the ceremonials of Egypt and some from Babylonia. But its central motives were reverence for the divine Head of the group, and strict observance of the laws which were believed to embody his will. Gradually Judaism molded the lives of its people in every detail. It was a system of wholesome discipline which was both a satisfaction to the devout and a refuge in time of trouble. Under the leadership of priestly officials the Jew became solicitous regarding the requirements for ceremonial piety and the holy life.

It is from this point of view that Judaism must be evaluated. The circumstances in which it developed gave its adherents an increasing interest in distinctions of definition and niceties of conduct which to non-Jews have often seemed unessential and trivial. And such was the comment of Jesus, himself a conforming Jew, upon the system elaborated by the scribes. But it is difficult to see how it could have survived in the trying period through which it passed without those safeguards of rigid conformity which made it capable of resisting persecution and other disintegrating forces. Around the ever more scrupulous observance of the Sabbath, accepted by the Hebrews, but kept with laxity by them;[46] around the practice of circumcision, generally observed by the Semitic peoples, but gradually given a higher meaning and a larger value by the Jews as a class rite; around the ministries of the sanctuary, where the priestly order held the center of its influence and authority; and above all, around the passion for its monotheistic faith, its most precious inheritance from the Hebrew past, the Jewish community rallied and began that career which has persisted through the centuries, has sent out its message into all lands and gathered first and last a multitude out of all races to its fellowship.

The new law proclaimed by Ezra at the great assembly of the Water Gate in Jerusalem became the nucleus of the oral and the written Torah which at last took form in the Talmud. The hope of the Third Isaiah for an immediate and numerous " return " of friendly spirits from other lands to assist in the enterprise[47] was unrealized, and increasing hardships, the result of hostile conditions around them, led to an ever-growing tolerance toward those who were not of their number or who refused to accept their interpretation of religion. Yet the territory of the little community actually grew, especially toward the north and west, and neighboring peoples were attracted to participation in the new enterprise. It was a small beginning, but great things were hoped for. As yet Judaism was the religion of a weak minority, even counting all the groups in other lands who might be considered as sympathetic with such an adventure. But the ambition of the men who held to this new and vigorous faith was that they and their successors were to become the majority in due season.

---

[46] Note the prophetic references to popular disregard of the Sabbath, Jer. 17:21–27; Ezek. 20:11–24; Isa. 56:2, 6; 58:13.

[47] Isa. 56:7, 8; 60:3–14.

VI

PRIESTHOOD AND GENEALOGIES

Like other lands of the orient Palestine from primitive times had numerous sanctuaries and holy places. To most of these some tradition was attached connecting them with divine visitations or sacred incidents in the past. To such spots pilgrimages were made, and there individual or community worship of some sort was carried on. Generally such holy sites were on elevations, and came to be known as the " high places." It was natural that some one in each case should take care of the open-air sanctuary and act as minister or guardian of the place. In this manner something in the nature of a priesthood took form and came to be recognized by the community. That seems to be the story of the origin of a priesthood among most ancient peoples. Ultimately these servants of the holy places were able to obtain formal recognition, and there grew up an order of priests with traditions of descent from some priestly and perhaps divinely selected ancestor. In this manner sanctuaries and their servitors came into being in quite simple and natural ways, and performed an important part in the life of towns and villages in a land like Palestine.

Long before the Hebrews arrived this custom was common in that country as among other Semitic peoples. When they made their way in, in various groups and at various times during the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C., they naturally fell into the customs of the land. They adopted its language, its habits and to a considerable extent its religion. Its sacred places became their own, and its customs of pilgrimage, sacrifice, priesthood and community organization were adopted. Some of these were not new to them; but in the beauties of mountain, forest and stream they found pleasure, and the festivals and holy days observed by the people appealed to their love of nature and their religious emotions. Soon the sanctuaries and the priestly customs of the land were adopted, and as the Hebrews gradually absorbed the earlier population, they organized their cultus to a marked degree upon the earlier foundations.

In early Hebrew days there was no special order of men constituting a priesthood. Every man was both ruler and priest in his own family. Instances of this simple and informal type of priestly ministry are given in the biblical sources. Gideon built an altar to Jahveh, and offered sacrifices upon it,[1] and Manoah the father of Samson made an offering of similar sort.[2] Neither of these men belonged to any priestly class. Similar was the case of Jephthah of Gilead.[3] Micah, a farmer of Ephraim, having secured two images, set apart his son as priest. Later on he employed a wandering Levite to minister in his family sanctuary, apparently because the man was in need of help and was a grandson of Moses.[4] As the father was priest in his family, so the sheikh of a village would be likely to exercise such functions in behalf of the community. On occasion an entire clan might gather in an emergency and make sacrifice, without the necessity of having any priestly administrator. Such seems to have been the case after the slaughter of the Benjaminites in the times of the judges.[5] But the Hebrews found the custom of sacrifice and recognition of something in the nature of a priesthood at the time of their entrance into Canaan, and they followed it. Melchizedek the Canaanite king of Salem was priest as well, and this seemed a natural and proper thing.[6] The prophet Samuel, though not belonging to any priestly clan, acted as celebrant of the rites of sacrifice on more than one occasion.[7]

---

[1] Judg. 6:24–26.

[2] Judg. 13:19.

[3] Judg. 11:31, 39.

[4] Judges, chapt. 17.

Following this custom the kings of Israel offered sacrifices, not as individuals, but as the representatives of the people. Similar in later and even modern times has been the custom of rulers among certain peoples, as in the case of the annual sacrifice offered, prior to the revolution, by the emperor of China at the Temple of Heaven. Saul,[8] David,[9] Solomon[10] and other kings of the Hebrew line offered sacrifices, and although it has been assumed by some writers that they employed the services of priests in these rites, there is no indication in the biblical sources that such was the case. It is only the assumption that a priest was necessary in the celebration of sacrificial worship that justifies this view. It is probable however that priestly ministries were recognized at an early period in Israel as appropriate and impressive. David is reported to have taken deep interest in the formal exercises of worship and to have made extensive preparations for the erection of a sanctuary in Jerusalem.[11] Allowance must be made for the fact that the narratives of his reign preserved in the prophetic writings took form centuries after his time, and doubtless included features of contemporary as well as of earlier cultus. This is more clearly evident in the elaborate emphasis placed by the Chronicler, writing in the third century B.C., upon the entire Levitical procedure of his day, as though it had been a feature of David's time.[12]

---

[5] Judg. 21:4.

[6] Gen. 14:18.

[7] 1 Sam. 7:9, 17; 9:12, 13; 10:8, etc. The late Chronicler, sensitive to the Levitic status of the priesthood in his day, provided Samuel with a Levite genealogy (1 Chron. 6:27, 28). This however is quite at variance with the record in 1 Sam. 1:1, which makes him a member of the tribe of Ephraim.

[8] 1 Sam. 13:9.

[9] 2 Sam. 6:13, 17; 24:25.

[10] 1 Kings 3:3, 4, 15; 8:5, 62, 64.

There appears to have been no restriction of priestly ministries to any one tribal or family group,[13] though it may well have been the fact that members of the tribe of Levi, as related to the leader Moses, and as being too few in numbers to obtain a tribal possession, were favored in the employment of village priests. The priests of the royal sanctuaries during the monarchy were appointees of the ruler, and in David's time included sons of the king.[14] Absalom, with no such appointment, conducted his own sacrifice in his attempt upon the throne,[15] as did Adonijah at a later time and for the same purpose.[16] There is no trace of a hereditary hierarchy until a much later time. The sons of Zadok, who had been appointed to the office of priest, and the sons of Abiathar, his colleague, were the king's servants, like other officers of the court.[17]

---

[11] 2 Sam. 6:1–18; 7:1–17; 1 Chron. 28:3, 11–18; 29:1–19.

[12] 1 Chron. 13:1–8; chapts. 13, 15–27.

[13] Encyc. Brit.[14] vol. 18, p. 481.

[14] 2 Sam. 8:15–18, especially v. 18, where the true reading is "priests"; but notice the Chronicler's change of this reading to "chiefs" (1 Chron. 18:17) in deference to the Levitical tradition.

[15] 2 Sam.. 15:12.

[16] 1 Kings 1:9, where the Hebrew reads, "Adonijah sacrificed sheep," etc.

One of the chief sanctuaries of early Hebrew history was at Shiloh, where Eli served as priest. He was one of the judges, and this fact seems to have led to his priestly ministry, although only late tradition connected him with the Levitical clans, and that only in a remote and vague manner.[18] The Shiloh sanctuary was the chief seat of worship in the strong tribe of Ephraim, and its priesthood might well have succeeded to the control of the temple service at Jerusalem, particularly as Abiathar, whom tradition connected with that line, became the close confidant of David, having escaped from the priestly colony at Nob when the slaughter of the priests occurred there.[19] But when he joined the conspiracy of Adonijah he lost the opportunity his friendship with David had given him, and was banished to Anathoth by the successful Solomon.[20] The latter conferred the priesthood on Zadok, who had stood by him in the contest for the throne, but who had no connection with the house of Eli; and this choice is justified by the Chronicler, who traces his line back through Eleazar to Aaron, with whom the entire priestly order in Israel was assumed to have begun.[21] It was of course the task of the late priestly historians to trace their genealogy to Aaron, or at least to provide their clan with as direct and convincing a line of descent as possible. The study of these Hebrew genealogies, like those of the later Jews and of other nations, is of interest as revealing the natural effort to connect the present with a distinguished past.

---

[17] 2 Sam. 8:17; 1 Chron. 29:22.

[18] 1 Sam. 1:9; 2:35, 36; 4:18.

[19] 1 Sam. 22:20–23.

[20] 2 Kings 2:26, 27 (cf. 1 Sam. 2:27–36).

[21] 1 Chron. 29:22; 6:49–53. It was the thesis of the late Priest Code that Aaron was the historic head of the priesthood in Israel.

During the early period and down to the times of Josiah (639–609 B.C.) there were sanctuaries in various parts of the country, each cared for by its own local priesthood. Besides the one at Shiloh there are references to those at Bethel,[22] Ramah,[23] Beersheba,[24] Carmel[25] and the various Mizpahs[26] and Gilgals,[27] though the more elaborate temple at Jerusalem drew popular interest to that center as the royal chapel. The earliest form of Israel's legislation, the Book of the Covenant,[28] seems to take it for granted that there might be worship at any place which the worshiper would choose, and that no particular priestly order was necessary. In addition to the instances in which the kings sacrificed where and when they would there are such stories as those of sacrifices by prophets like Elijah and Elisha.[29] It would seem then that until the time of the Deuteronomic law there was no restriction of worship to a central sanctuary nor to a special priestly order. Gradually, however, members of the Levitical clans secured increasing recognition as proper persons for sacrificial duties. This may have been due to traditions of priestly groups as far back as the Egyptian period or, as already suggested, to the fact that these tribesmen were related to the family of Moses, and were few in numbers and therefore possessed a certain claim upon the good will of their countrymen. At all events the practice was an old one, and the Levite families did not fail to avail themselves of the privileges accorded them and to increase them as opportunity offered.

---

[22] Gen. 35:14; Judg. 20:18, 26; 21:2–4; 1 Sam. 10:3.

[23] 1 Sam. 7:17; 9:12.

[24] Amos 5:5, where Bethel, Gilgal and Beersheba are named as sanctuary cities.

[25] 1 Kings 18:20, 30 (note the reference to the ruined "altar of Jahveh").

[26] Judg. 7:3–12; 10:17–24, etc.

[27] 1 Sam. 10:8; 11:14, and the references to Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah as sacred places in 1 Sam. 7:16.

[28] Exodus, chapts. 20–23 = "E," and Exodus, chapt. 34 = "J."

[29] 1 Kings 18:30–39; 19:31.

With the discovery of the code of Deuteronomy in the temple in the reign of Josiah, 621 B.C., a code that had presumably taken form in the dark days of persecution under Manasseh, an entire change in the status of the priesthood was established. The reformers who revised the older Book of the Covenant into this new form were sensitive to the dangers that the looser laws of the past had permitted. Henceforth the office of priest was restricted to men of the tribe of Levi, with the tradition that at Mt. Sinai Jahveh separated that clan for the sacred work, and that Eleazar the son of Aaron succeeded his father in the priestly office.[30] This statement was supposed to explain the fact that this tribe had no regional inheritance in Israel. No distinction was made among them so far as status was concerned. All were equally eligible for such functions. They are regularly named " the priests, the Levites," or " the priests the sons of Levi."[31] It was not until a later age that the separation occurred between the priests of the family of Aaron, or indeed more narrowly of Zadok, and the ordinary Levites, who performed the common service of the sanctuary. Later still there was a third order, the Nethinim, whose duties were not specified, but seem to have been of a still humbler sort.

---

[30] Deut. 10:6, 8, 9.

[31] Deut. 18:1; 21:5.

In this manner something of a hierarchy began, which gradually became an ambitious and classified series of grades, from temple servant to high priest.[32]

The functions of the priests were various. Taken as they occur in the sources, they ministered at the sanctuaries by attending to the sacrifices when the people came bringing their offerings and partook of the sacrificial meals.[33] In the times before the centralization of worship at Jerusalem in accordance with the Deuteronomic code they were the village pastors. They gave instructions in the name of Jahveh. They divined for those who asked for counsel, either by the use of the ephod, a priestly garment or a divining image, or by what was known as "Urim and Thummim," probably a form of inquiry by means of a magic stone.[34] They acted as health officers when people or articles were brought for their inspection.[35] In a late hymn of the northern tribes their duties are described in the words: "They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law; they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt offerings upon thine altar."[36] This poem was attributed to Moses by the authors of Deuteronomy.[37]

It seems evident that the development of a hierarchy, with a chief priest or high priest, had no relation to the early Hebrew plan of sanctuary organization, but was the natural evolution of an order of functionaries rendering service at an important center of holy ministries like the temple at

---

[32] 1 Chron. 9:2, etc.

[33] 1 Sam. 1:3–5.

[34] Gen. 25:22; 1 Sam. 14:3, 18, 19; Num. 27:21; Ezra 2:63; Neh. 7:65.

[35] Leviticus, chapt. 13; Luke 5:14.

[36] Deut. 33:10.

[37] Willett, *The Bible Through the Centuries,* p. 61.

Jerusalem. The earlier sources make no mention of such a superior officer as a high priest. It may well be that the importance of the capital conferred a growing prestige upon the oldest or the most efficient of the priests at the sanctuary, and thus led to a succession in that office. Similar, as the historian knows, was the development of the priesthood in the Christian churches both of the east and the west. The first mention of a superior priest in the Old Testament is in connection with the discovery of the law book in the temple.[38] In that instance Hilkiah is called the " high priest." But this may be the result of custom in the later age of the writer of Kings, or even of revision in the age of the Priest Code.[39] The first authentic reference to a " high priest " by a contemporary writer is Zechariah's statement regarding " Joshua the high priest " in the vision of the trial in which the satan was the accuser.[40] It was the custom apparently during the entire period previous to the destruction of Jerusalem and the great dispersion to speak of even the most important priest at the temple merely as " the priest," and this in instances where the full title of " high priest " would be expected if it were borne.[41]

Subsequent to that event, as the churchly idea took increasing form and the older customs of the monarchy were forgotten, the title of " high priest " or " great priest " became common, and by the time of the Chronicler the various orders of priests and Levites were sufficiently fixed to be recognized and customary.[42] Different grades among the Levites are mentioned,[43] and careful distinctions are made between the duties of the two groups, some of which are attributed by the Chronicler to David himself.[44] The development of the priestly theory went forward among some of the Hebrews in the dispersion as well as in Judah, and indeed much more freely. Tradition asserted that Ezekiel, a man of priestly family among the Hebrews in Babylonia, performed the service of a prophet in Tel-abib. His efforts were devoted to the revival of the national spirit under the inspiration of a description of Jerusalem as he hoped it would be rebuilt.[45] Of this city the new temple was to be the most important structure, and around it was to be organized the sacred community with its various orders of priests and officers. The code of Ezekiel was never actually adopted into the life of the Jerusalem community, but its influence upon later legislation may be traced. It was a distinct criticism of the Deuteronomic scheme, notably in the common status there given to the priests and the Levites. In Ezekiel's program the priesthood was limited carefully to the descendants of Zadok, and a line was drawn between them and other Levites.[46] The king disappeared from the picture, and a prince who was a rather insignificant figure took his place in this priestly republic. It was Ezekiel's view that the Levites really represented the former priests of the demolished high places, and, though admitted to Jerusalem and to religious duties, were degraded to a subordinate place.[47] This was contrary to the thought of the Deuteronomists, who insisted that the country priests who came up to the capital were to have the same standing as their brethren.[48]

---

[38] 2 Kings 22:4, 18.

[39] In the same connection mention is made of " Hilkiah the great priest," " the priests of the second order," and " the keepers of the threshold " (2 Kings 23:4); and of " Seraiah the head priest, and Zephaniah the second priest " (2 Kings 25:18).

[40] Zech. 3:1 ff.

[41] " Zadok the priest " (1 Chron. 16:39); " Jehoidah the priest " (2 Chron. 23:8); " Uriah the priest " (Isa. 8:2).

---

[42] "Amariah, the head priest" (hac-cohen ha-r'osh, 2 Chron. 19:11); "Jehoidah the head priest" (2 Chron. 24:6); "Azariah the head priest, and all the priests," (2 Chron. 26:20); "the ruler of the house of God," (*nagid beth Elohim,* 2 Chron. 31:10, 13); "Aaron the head priest" (Ezra 7:6); "the great priest" (*hac-cohen hag-gadol,* Neh. 13:28).

[43] "Prince of the Levites" (1 Chron. 15:22); "heads of fathers' houses of the Levites" (1 Chron. 15:12); "Asaph the chief, and second to him Zechariah" (1 Chron. 16:15).

[44] 1 Chron. 15:2. The difference between the earlier and the later view may be seen in the comparison of 1 Kings 8:3, where the priests carried the ark, with 2 Chron. 5:4, the same event, only that it is the Levites who bear the ark.

[45] Ezek. 1:3; chapts. 40–48. Cf. however the view of Torrey, *op. cit.*

This evolution of the priestly function has a distinct bearing upon the relation of the Jewish community in Jerusalem to the older Hebrew establishment. In the days of the kingship, north and south, the priesthood was a somewhat decorative though not a really important body. With Judaism it became the ruling class. The priests among the Jews of the developing province of Judah became an increasingly important feature of the community. Their various orders were multiplied and classified.[49] Their numbers greatly increased, until they must have been as numerous on the streets of the capital as are the yellow-robed Buddhist priests on the thoroughfares of Burmah and Ceylon. They were more powerful than any other class in the community, and the head of the order, the head priest or high priest, became the ruler of the city and of the Jews in other regions. Later on the high priesthood became subject to the various corruptions and venalities inseparable from power unrestrained by moral integrity. It was at times conferred by foreign conquerors as a mark of favor, and at times was bought by aspirants who had no other claim than ambition. Even the Asmoneans, the family which brought such renown to Judah in the second pre-Christian century, assumed the title and functions of the high priesthood with only the most shadowy claim to Levitic lineage.

---

[46] Ezek. 44:15.

[47] Ezek. 44:10–14.

[48] Deut. 18:7.

[49] 1 Chron. 24:1; 28:21; cf. Luke 1:5, 8.

It was insisted by the priestly writers that all the men suitable for service in the sanctuary belonged to the tribe of Levi, and that the priests were of the clan of Aaron, and were later limited to the family of Zadok. In support of this tradition the late Priest Code included a narrative of the miraculous choice of Levi among the tribes by the test of the twelve rods, one for each tribe, among which the rod of Aaron, the representative of Levi, budded in token of the divine choice.[50] It is probable that in the case of the priests, especially in later days, there was greater effort made to trace genealogical succession than in other clans. Yet as in other instances the priestly families must have been made up of many stocks. The Levites in early times shared with the Simeonites the reputation of rough-handedness and brutality, perhaps because of their avaricious and presumptuous conduct, and on them was pronounced the malediction, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel," taken from an ancient oracle ascribed to the patriarch Jacob.[51] Like the remainder of the Hebrews they were recruited from many sources. The Law of Holiness,[52] a fragment of the Hebrew legislation which carried the ideas of Ezekiel still further, and was included in the later Priest Code of Ezra's time, distinctly recognized the right of the people to acquire slaves from other nations, and this privilege applied equally to the priestly class as to others.[53] The result could only be an amalgamation of racial elements. The application of this principle to the priestly families is definitely set forth.[54]

---

[50] Num. 17:1–11.

[51] Gen. 49:7.

[52] Leviticus, chapts. 17–26.

It is thus apparent that in spite of the assumption that the race of the priests was derived from authentic and divinely chosen ancestors and that care was taken throughout the history to preserve untainted their tribal integrity, the claim was in reality late and incapable of validation. It was only after the downfall of the Hebrew state and the rise of Judaism that the new ecclesiastical interests developed a priestly caste and led to the attempt to connect the growing hierarchy with the beginnings of Hebrew life. Accepting the view of Ezekiel that the Levites were in reality the descendants of the "priests of the common people" who were permitted to minister at the northern sanctuaries by Jeroboam,[55] there could have been no racial exclusiveness in the Levitical order after they were once received into accredited standing, as the Deuteronomists insisted. But the history of the priesthood in Israel is too obscure, and the indications of irregularity and intermixture in the succession too suggestive to permit any confidence in an untainted racial purity even in this important group of officials. This consideration receives further emphasis through the study of the entire subject of genealogies as recorded in the Hebrew and later Jewish and Christian sources.

[53] Lev. 25:44.

[54] Lev. 22:11.

[55] 1 Kings 12:31, 32; Ezek. 44:10, 11.

In studying the subject of the rise of the Jewish people, and their connection, intimate, remote or fictitious, with the Hebrew life of the classic age, the significance of genealogical interest in the later documents of the Old Testament becomes evident. This was the period in which Judaism took form. As the disastrous effects of the great dispersion became increasingly obvious, the desire to connect the new community with the old was natural, and among some of the members of the Jewish group, particularly those of the priestly party, it became a passion. Just as the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. and the collapse of the Hebrew state stimulated the desire to preserve the records of the past and led to the production of such literary materials as the Samuel-Kings narratives, so the gradual disappearance of Hebrew life from the province awakened the interest of the new and composite generation in securing some genealogical connection with the Hebrews of Israel and Judah. The most direct method of gaining such contact with the past was by use of the names found in the older records and their employment in the preservation or construction of lines of descent reaching to their own day. It is evident that as early as the Chronicler's age, in the fourth century B.C., this interest had become specific and professional. The Talmud is authority for the statement that there were men who spent all their time in making and studying genealogies which were based on the lists found in Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah.[56] The Chronicler refers to the "Acts of Rehoboam, written after the manner of genealogies."[57] The same source implies the interest taken in that day in "fathers' houses" among the Jews.[58]

[56] Kidd. 76.6. [57] 2 Chron. 12:15. [58] Ezra 2:59, 62; Neh. 7:61.

That there were family registers in some households, or that this was the tradition, is implied in the sources.[59] It would seem from these references that there came a time when, as among other and later races, men were anxious to prove their descent from well-known, royal or priestly ancestors.

No people in the early period of its history is concerned about its ancestry. It is only when time has passed or tragedy has overtaken it that genealogical considerations begin to secure attention. A young people is too much occupied with the adventure of making good to waste time in a search for its past. Only when that past has measurably faded from remembrance or is threatened by national calamity does this solicitude regarding origins arise. Among the Hebrews such an interest came to birth only after the destruction of Jerusalem. Naturally this led to much genealogical activity and a considerable degree of invention. The Arabs of the age of the crusades were much given to the same order of speculation. The officials of Saladin's court traced his line through thirty-three generations to Adam. But he insisted that he knew nothing of his ancestors beyond his grandfather. Professor William Robertson Smith, one of the foremost authorities on Semitic origins, speaking of Hebrew and Arabic genealogies, says, "The system of the genealogists and the method by which traditional data are worked into the system are totally unworthy of credit."[60]

The Hebrews of the late period and the Jews of later days were not exceptional in this regard. Most nations which have attained a place in history have exhibited the same interest, and have cherished ancestral traditions of the same more or less questionable character. All people who have any sensitiveness to historical values desire an ancestry of distinction, and if a lineage of that order is not available, it is not impossible to contrive one with the aid of historical records or accommodating genealogists. It was Virgil's eagerness to glorify Roman imperialism by connecting it with the story of Troy and its heroes which gave impulse to his writing of the Aenead. Dante was of the same mind, though he did not employ the device of genealogical lists to fortify his thesis. Italians like other races have been fond of tracing their ancestry to eminent names in Roman annals. Scaevola, the patriot who committed a fault in the early days of Rome and so bitterly repented that he burned off his offending hand in the Forum, left a name so illustrious that two thousand years later Sforza of Milan, the greatest leader of the middle ages, coveting a long ancestry, decided that he was a descendant of Scaevola, and pressed the names into a fancied similarity.[61] Such resemblances in names have been the fruitful sources of genealogies, as when the Massimo family of Rome claimed descent from Fabius Maximus. The oldest families in Europe are to be found in Rome, where history has had a more continuous course than in any other occidental area, and yet no family in Rome can trace its history beyond the middle ages. The Gaetani, the oldest of all, go back to the tenth century A.D. The Colonnas and the Orsini, the next oldest houses, date from 1100 and 1190 respectively. The claims of some Italian families to antiquity are diverting, arrogating through fabulous generations their descent from the ancient Romans, when in reality they inherit the blood of barbarians of the north, those hardy invaders who had only disdain for a conquered soil and a degenerate people.

---

[59] Ezek. 13:9; Ezra 8:20.

[60] *Kinship and Marriage*, p. 175.

---

[61] Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

The oldest reigning families in Europe do not go back beyond the middle ages. The Hohanstaufens and Hapsburgs date from the eleventh century, and the Hohenzollerns from the seventeenth. The British royal family traces its chain of descent through several questionable links to William the Conqueror, but confesses that his own origin was marked with the bar sinister; and that only by the most tenuous thread, through the family of his wife, Matilda of Flanders, was there any connection with Alfred the Great.[62] Alquin, the famous scholar of the court of Charlemagne said that in his day there was no man left of the ancient stock of English kings. If the testimony of genealogists like Dugdale and Barron is to be accepted, many of the claims made for nobility and even royalty are as mythical as the stories of Arthur and the Round Table.[63] The line of English kings from the Conqueror's time runs over some very uneven ground through Plantagenet, Tudor, Stuart, and Guelph stock to the Wettins (changed to Windsors) of the present day. The passion for ancestry that came to its flowering in the reign of Elizabeth produced a noxious crop of genealogical fables nourished by the pedigree mongers who were ready on demand to produce mythical forefathers for the ambitious. Many of these were quite content with a traditional ancestor who was reputed to have been " a companion of the Conqueror." Until recent generations family names have been the exception. Most men contented themselves with a baptismal name, like John or William, or at most a " son " name, like Johnson or Williamson, running through the Irish, Scotch, Welsh, French or Dutch variants of O', Mac, Ap, De, Von or Van, if indeed the name was not derived from the locality in which a man lived, like John of Bedford, or William of Norfolk.

---

[62] William of Malmesbury, *De Gesta regum* (Stubbs ed. p. 267).

[63] Encyc. Brit.^{14} *Genealogies,* Vol. 10, p. 102.

In most cases it is only continuity of land tenure that insures genealogical integrity. People are easily misled by similarity of names, and are betrayed into fictitious claims for their families. It is not difficult in American families of landed stability or historical interest to trace ancestry back to Revolutionary or even colonial days. When the search is carried to European soil the difficulty is increased with every generation, and competent genealogists are of the opinion that few landed or noble families can trace their ancestry back to the middle ages, and none beyond. The line of Rurik that claimed Russian sovereignty from 862 to 1598 A.D. produced a swarm of claimants to royal blood. But Michael Romanoff, who headed the list of the later Czars in 1613 had no connection with the Rurik line. In fact no European family makes serious claim to bridge the dark ages with its genealogy. Certain Brahmin families in India may claim some valid and continuous connection with Vedic times through the operation of the caste system. Probably the nearest approach to authentic family antiquity is to be found among the Chinese, where many villages are virtually family units which have occupied the same sites for many centuries. Instances are found all through history of extravagant claims to ancient lineage, as in the case of Sargon the younger, who boasted of the 350 kings who had reigned before him, or the Japanese insistence on the 225 ancestors in the royal line of the Mikado.

If this legendary character attaches to most if not all of the genealogical lists of European families, where continuity of land tenure and of titular descent would be likely to prevail if anywhere, much more truly would it characterize the records of a people like the Jews, whose origins were of the most mingled pattern, and whose career has been marked by the most tragic territorial and political misadventures. Any connection with the ancient Hebrew stock, save the most tenuous, must be abandoned. The numerous invading groups, chiefly Edomite, which poured into Judah to avail themselves of the opportunities which the reviving colony offered, brought with them no ancestral validations. The new and complex community started therefore as free from tradition as did the Hebrew clans who entered Palestine in the days of the Ramses.

For this very reason, as soon as the first activities of the growing city permitted, and the priestly nature of its organization was determined, the desire for some definite connection with the past arose. This is no accident in the history of new communities. The absence of authentic records of the past is likely to stimulate the desire to preserve or create some degree of continuity with the earlier story of the locality and the people who formed its previous population. In no manner is this object so easily attained as by means of genealogical lists actually possessed or contrived without serious difficulty on the basis of current tradition. Moreover those in the rising town who were sensitive to this interest had ample suggestion supplied by such lists of names in the Hebrew writings which were now their classic literature. So notable a body of documents produced chiefly on the soil now occupied by them, could not fail to be normative in nearly all phases of their life. In those records they found lists of names purporting to be genealogies. There were two variant but related groups of long-lived patriarchs,[64] a table of the sons of Noah,[65] a list of the descendants of Shem down to Abraham,[66] the long list of descendants of Esau,[67] the table of Jacob's children who went into Egypt during the premiership of Joseph,[68] the genealogy of Moses and Aaron,[69] and other series of names of less importance.[70] The longer and more important of these were from late priestly sources, and disclose the marked interest of the writers in genealogical and Levitical matters.

With this basis of concern for lineage in their accepted scriptures, and with the arousal of interest due to their need of association with the past, there soon developed among the people of Jerusalem a group, probably of priestly connections, in whose minds the matter of genealogies became a subject of deep concern, investigation and elaboration. In the case of the priests this was an affair of consequence. As among most nations the priesthood was presumed to be a hereditary office. In the later years of Judaism this was a matter of the utmost importance, as the narratives of the Chronicler and passages in the New Testament show.[71] In fact the records of the Chronicler, including Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, written in the fourth century, generations after the days of Ezra and the beginnings of Judaism, are a veritable " scroll of genealogies," whose purpose is apparent throughout the narratives. That purpose is the validation of the Jewish claim already asserted in that writer's day, that his people were of continuous and untainted descent from the ancient Hebrew race, that their priests were of undoubted Aaronic stock, and that there were records attesting these claims. In fact he went so far as to affirm that " all Israel were reckoned by genealogies; and behold they are written in the book of the Kings of Israel." [72]

---

[64] Genesis, chapts. 4, 5. Probably a convenient device for filling in the interval from the assumed date of the creation to the days of Noah and the deluge.

[65] Genesis, chapt. 10. It proves to be a geographical list of the neighboring peoples of whom the Hebrew author knew, and their localities.

[66] Gen. 11:10–26.

[67] Genesis, chapt. 36. An obvious effort to relate the Edomites who had pushed into Judah and were the major element in the population of the colony, to Abraham and the classic Hebrew tradition.

[68] Gen. 46:8–27.

[69] Ex. 6:14–25.

[70] E.g. Gen. 22:20–24; 25:1–4, 12–18; 35:23–27, etc.

This was the traditional view held by Jews in the years since Josephus, in the first Christian century, in his work " Against Apion," makes it his purpose to assert the purity of Jewish blood, and the carefully authenticated genealogies of the priestly order.[73] The claim to priestly descent became increasingly a badge of honor, even though it might be indirect and incapable of proof, as in the case of the Maccabees and of Josephus himself. Similarly it was really important that every Jew have some traditional connection with one of the ancient tribes of Israel. Though these tribes had long since disappeared, and there was no way in which such a connection could be traced, they were still regarded as ideally existent, and the claim to tribal lineage was held to be entirely valid. Examples of this ancestral attachment are to be found in the New Testament in the cases of Elizabeth,[74] Anna,[75] and the apostle Paul.[76] The genealogies of Jesus are striking illustrations of the effort to connect him with historic and important names in Hebrew history.[77] The same Jewish sentiment regarding the continued existence of the twelve tribes is observed in several passages in the Christian sources,[78] where it is the purpose of the writers to assume the ideal survival of the Hebrew tribes, and to assert the identity of the living Jewish generation with that survival. The influence of Ezra and the passion of the Chronicler may be observed in these genealogical interests. This

---

[71] 1 Chronicles, chapts. 24, 25; Luke 1:5, 9. This in spite of the fact that in the later Maccabean and Herodian days the priesthood, even the high priesthood, was bestowed as a political favor at the caprice of rulers.

[72] 1 Chron. 9:1.

[73] Josephus, *Contra Ap.* 1. 7.

[74] "Of the daughters of Aaron," i.e., the wife of a priest, Luke 1:5.

[75] "Of the tribe of Asher," a north-Israel tribe that vanished after 721 B.C.

[76] "Of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin," Rom. 11:1; "of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews," Phil. 3:5.

[77] Matthew, chapt. 1; Luke, chapt. 3. It will be noted that these genealogies vary widely in content, that one appears to run through the royal line of Israel back to Abraham, the other through a different line to Adam, and that neither gives the genealogy of Mary, but both belong to Joseph. They are clearly from different sources, perhaps one Palestinian and the other Hellenistic, and neither belongs to the central body of the Gospels. Similar variations in Old Testament lists are found in several passages; e.g. in the comparison of Gen. 4:16–22 with Gen. 5:1–32; of 1 Chron. 6:17–21 with 1 Chron. 6:39–43, and with 1 Chron. 6:44–47.

[78] Acts 26:7, Paul before Agrippa, "Our twelve tribes serve God"; Jas. 1:1, "to the twelve tribes which are scattered over the world"; Rev. 7:4, "from every tribe of the children of Israel." The disappearance of the tribes from the history however is indicated by the silence of 2 Kings, and particularly the absence of reference to tribal relations in Ezra and Nehemiah, save in two or three very late passages, such as Neh. 11:3–24 and 11:25–36, where Judah and Benjamin may be merely names of districts. In later days a family would be likely to determine its tribal relation from its locality in Palestine, as in Tob. 1:1; Judith 8:1; 2 Macc. 3:4 (Cf. W. H. Bennett, art. "*Tribes*" in Jewish Encyc. and Cook, art. "*Tribes*" in Encyc. Brit.).

is still further evident in the documents of the Talmud, where much space is devoted to the subject. The spurious character of many of the genealogical lists is freely admitted.[79] It was the theory among the Jews, particularly of the genealogizing and Levitizing groups, that every member of the race could trace his line back to Jacob. This, of course, requires no comment.[80] The experiences of the Jews, both in origin and later history, particularly after the fall of Jerusalem in the Roman war, were in the last degree unfavorable to such a view. Yet the further removed and the more indefinite they became, the more confident were the assertions regarding their descent. This is a characteristic by no means limited to Jewish families!

The doubtful sentiment that prevailed among thoughtful Jews regarding these genealogical speculations is illustrated in the comments of the apostle Paul on the entire subject. Although affirming his deep interest in his Jewish heritage and his warm affection for his racial brethren, he warns his friend Timothy not to give heed to "fictions and interminable pedigrees," and cautions Titus to shun foolish questionings and genealogies, as unprofitable and vain.[81]

---

[79] See the interesting article on *Genealogies* by Dr. E. G. Hirsch in the Jewish Encyclopedia, in which the zeal for family and priestly records is shown to be late.

[80] G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names,* p. 68. He points out the fact that only continuity of location and land tenure can validate genealogical assurance, and in commenting on the Chronicler's method he thinks the fact that in 1 Chron. 4:34–41 the names are those of the Chronicler's own time, and are at least not genuine survivals, makes it probable that the list is largely an invention. See also the articles on *Genealogies* in Encyc. Bib. and H. B. D.

[81] 1 Tim. 1:4 (Goodspeed); Tit. 3:9.

VII

THE GROWTH OF JUDAISM

The first period of Jewish history, from its beginnings under Nehemiah and Ezra in the closing years of the fifth century B.C. to the Maccabean revolution in the first half of the second, was marked by such variations of fortune as a new state might expect to encounter. There was both gain and loss in population. New immigrants were attracted from the neighboring regions by the promise which the growing town held out. Individuals of Hebrew stock or sympathies came from Egypt and the east, lured by the hope of a restored Zion and the expansion of a priestly law. There was a measurable and constant infiltration from the steppe, as there had been after every crisis in Hebrew life, and as there was in later Maccabean days. Especially significant was the Edomite element from southern Judah, where Hebron became the capital of this tribe as it was pushed out from the region of Petra by the incoming Nabateans.

On the other hand there were losses from the departure of disappointed and disillusioned members of the community, who failed to realize their first expectations, either religious or economic, and tried their fortunes elsewhere. The drastic reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra, particularly regarding intermarriage with non-Hebrews, soon fell into abeyance. Indeed it was impossible that they could succeed, both because of their severe tone and the hopelessly mixed character of the population. Like the reforms of Josiah and

Akhenaten they soon suffered disuse, though later generations seem to have regarded them as having been actually realized in the rising Jewish state. The first enthusiasm of the community, inspired by the energy of its leaders, declined. For a time the temple services which had fallen to low levels in the dark days before the final collapse of Judah were given a new and important place in the life of Jerusalem under the influence of the priestly law of Ezra. This was inevitable in the change of its character from a royal to a priestly town. The ministers of religion were observant of the rites of temple service, but the spirit of prophecy was lacking, the ideals of Deuteronomy were forgotten, and paganism crept in with the strange intrusions from neighboring lands.

The last years of the Persian era have left few records bearing upon the province of Judah. Such biblical material as has survived from this period is scattered and difficult of assignment. Certain passages in Joel, in the Third Isaiah and in the late psalms give hints of tragedies that befell the city and brought further dispersion to its population. A punitive expedition by Artaxerxes III. Ochus (358–337 B.C.) to crush the widespread revolt of his western provinces probably involved Judah, and seems to have left echoes of destruction, persecution and dispersion. This bloody ruler ordered many of the Jews removed by his lieutenant Orophernes (the Holofernes of the book of Judith) to Hyrcania and Babylonia. Also there is record of persecution by Bagoas (Bagoses), another Persian officer.[1] It is not unlikely that such instances of temple desecration and deportation of citizens as occurred in 346 B.C. under Ochus took place at other times in the closing years of the Persian rule.

---

[1] Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* XI. 7. 1; cf. Psalms 44, 74, 79, 89; Isaiah, chapts. 24–27; 63:7–64:12, etc.

In this era of variable fortune when the city was struggling through good and evil days it was natural that the minds of the more hopeful of its people should turn to the widely scattered groups in other lands who as refugees or expatriates had departed from Judah during its fresh misfortunes, or were the children of Hebrew exiles of former times. The actual numbers of such "Jews," whose former connection with the province or whose religious interests in the new adventure justified in some measure the use of that name, must have been considerable.[2] That there were such communities in Mesopotamia, Persia and Egypt as well as in other portions of the Near East is clear from the references in the late prophetic books, and their numbers were constantly recruited by pilgrims and refugees from Jerusalem through the whole of the Persian and Greek periods. In the thought of at least some of the more optimistic members of the Judean community this outlying nimbus of sympathetic and related people was a great host, and might be expected to play an important rôle in the local affairs of the lands they occupied, or to assist in the enlargement and enrichment of Jerusalem. This idealistic and extravagant view had no small effect in sustaining the morale of the struggling city. Such is the sentiment expressed in the romance of Esther, where the numbers and importance of the Jews in the Persian empire are out of all proportion to the historical facts. In the case of Egypt there was much to justify the mood, for the Jewish population there reached very considerable proportions in the Greek age, and played no inconspicuous part in the political and economic status of Alexandria and other centers.

---

[2] Olmstead, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

Most of all it was the confident expectation of the Jews of the province that help would come from this outlying circle of interested co-religionists. Such had been the confident expectation in the Hebrew times of disaster that culminated in the dispersions of 597, 586 and later days as voiced by Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Second Isaiah and other prophets.[3] It was no less the hope of Judah in the later days of stress. In the Third Isaiah this anticipation is more than once expressed with confidence.[4] But these hopes were realized in only the most limited degree. There was little to encourage any notable increase in the city's population in these uncertain days. As the author of Daniel later wrote, they were "troublous times."[5]

During the same period, the closing years of the Persian régime, a second religious community was taking form in the region north of Judah. This was the Samaritan group, the survivors of the northern tribes, who lost their national estate in the Assyrian reduction of Samaria in 721 B.C. This remnant of the kingdom of Israel established itself in the region of the ancient sanctuary of Shechem, which the Greeks later called Neapolis or New-Town, and which in modern times has been given the Arab form of the name, Nablous. Between this community and Jerusalem there grew up a sentiment of jealousy and aversion, probably because they were largely contemporary in origin, and each claimed to be the authentic heir to the Hebrew inheritance. In the days of the Chronicler this hostility had reached a degree of intensity which affirmed that the Samaritans had offered to assist in the rebuilding of the temple, but had been refused participation in the enterprise.[6]

---

[3] Cf. Zephaniah's expectation of returning pilgrims from beyond the rivers of Nubea, perhaps Hebrew garrisons in the upper Nile region (Zeph. 3:10).

[4] Isaiah, chapts. 60 and 61 *passim.*

[5] Dan. 9:25.

To this episode there is no reference in the contemporary documents of Haggai and Zechariah. Indeed the prophetic attitude of that age was one of hospitality to all interested peoples, as witness the messages of the Second Isaiah and Malachi. But the journal of Nehemiah[7] is evidence that in the later years of the fifth century B.C. the two communities were no longer tolerant of each other, and each was asserting its exclusive right to be the interpreter of the monotheism which the Hebrew prophets had preached. To increase the difficulty there had been intermarriages between leading families on both sides, and this led to various forms of sharp practice which left their effects through years of bitterness that are reflected in the later records of the Old Testament and in the New. The decisive breach was caused by the erection of a rival temple on Mt. Gerizim, perhaps during the closing years of Darius II (424–404) about the end of the fifth century B.C. or early in the fourth.

The constitution of the Samaritan community was the "Law of Moses" as embodied in the first five books of the Hebrew scriptures, the complete Pentateuchal Code, and a shortened form of the book of Joshua. These are preserved to the present time in two ancient rolls in the Samaritan

[6] Cf. Ezra, chapt. 4.

[7] See Neh. 2:20 and chapts. 4 and 6.

synagogue in Nablous. It was the Samaritan claim that Mt. Gerizim where their temple was erected was the veritable mountain of Abraham's sacrifice and the mountain of the giving of the law. They maintain to this day a priestly order asserting direct descent from Aaron, and hold an annual Passover sacrifice on the holy mountain. In their version of the Pentateuch the word "Gerizim" appears in passages like Deut. 27:4; it is their claim that the law of the single sanctuary in Deuteronomy refers to this mountain, and not to Jerusalem;[8] that the Jews are a later, mixed, and schismatic race who took root in Judah and departed from the orthodox teachings of Moses; that they, the Samaritans, are of true, pure and continuous racial stock, sincere in their zeal for the law, and loyal to the traditions of their Hebrew past. Their numbers, which once extended to numerous places in Palestine and even beyond, have now dwindled to less than a hundred, and their literature, which at one time was extensive, is now reduced to a few works on their history and the Torah. Yet this small and pathetic group, claiming to be the rightful heir of Israel, has kept its place in its ancient home in Palestine through all the centuries since its beginning, and is perhaps the oldest continuous religious community in the world.[9]

In spite of the difficulties through which Jerusalem passed in these years, difficulties economic, moral and religious, there was a marked determination on the part of a considerable group to maintain the ideals of the founders of the community, their monotheistic faith, their loyalty to Jahveh, the continuity and regularity of the temple services, and the observance and expansion of the priestly laws. The monarchy had passed away. The city was governed in accordance with a priestly pattern. Trust in God and obedience to the law were the accepted means of securing the divine favor and a measure of protection and material prosperity. The factors favorable to this effort were the presence and continued services of the temple, which in spite of neglect and desecration had survived as one of the few buildings remaining from the former Hebrew age. This was the center of priestly authority and influence, and afforded a degree of resistance to the pagan ideas and customs which came in from neighboring communities.

---

[8] Deut. 12:5 ff.; cf. John 4:20.

[9] Possible echoes of the Jewish attitude toward the Samaritans may be found in such passages as Isa. 57:3–12; 65:1–5; 66:1–4. Note the attitude of Jesus in contrast with the Jewish prejudices of his day against the Samaritans (Luke 10:33; John 4:4–9; etc.). At one period they possessed synagogues in Egypt, and even in Rome. The temple on Mt. Gerizim was finally destroyed by the Romans in 484 A.D. The regular line of high priests became extinct in 1623. The present chief priest is Khaim Ishak. On the entire subject consult Montgomery, *The Samaritans*.

But the formal services of religion were not always efficient safeguards against prevailing evils. The late psalms and certain prophetic fragments hint at an inner circle of the pious who lamented alike the growing secularism of the age and the formalism and ineffectiveness of the priestly ministries. On the whole, however, it was felt that the observance and expansion of the Torah was the surest guarantee of success. In spite of the elaborate character of the Priest Code promulgated by Ezra, which went far toward setting monotheism on a firm basis in the province, there were many particulars in which that law might be expanded to advantage. It was inevitable that such a program of elaboration should be undertaken by men who possessed something of Ezra's priestly and scribal enthusiasm. Rules relating to such matters as the Sabbath, the ritual observances of daily life and the study of the scriptures, in which the Hebrew legislation was not thought sufficiently specific, began to take form in a manner that forecast the talmudic activities of later centuries. New feasts were added to the calendar, as in the case of Purim, whose origin is unknown, but whose inauguration appears to date from this period.[10]

The cessation of prophecy as well as of an actually authentic priesthood was deplored,[11] but compensations were discovered in more precise legal refinements, in the gradual development of apocalyptic, and the evolution of a new apologetic and evangelism. No doubt something of this zeal for the enlargement of the area of religious observance sprang from the sense of rivalry with the Samaritan sanctuary on the north. In the later years of the Persian period Samaria revived and became a city of consequence, the residence of a Persian officer of the district, who may have had an adviser in Jerusalem. The neighboring temple on Mt. Gerizim, a recently erected shrine, might well be regarded as a dangerous competitor with the somewhat dilapidated sanctuary in Jerusalem, a more or less dismantled survivor of the days of Haggai and Zechariah. It was not until the Maccabees and Herod gave Jerusalem its political and artistic significance that the danger of Samaritan rivalry passed away. Since that time it is the Jews and not their less numerous and resourceful competitors who have held the stage of history, and given their interpretation of the ancient controversy.

---

[10] The book of Esther offers a fanciful suggestion (Esth. 9:24–32).

[11] Ezra 2:63; Neh. 7:63; 1 Macc. 4:46; 14:41.

The Persian age came to an abrupt ending with the brilliant conquests of Alexander the Great in the near and farther east. The map of the world was changed by the campaigns of this military genius between the years 333 and 328 B.C. By the Jews in Palestine his triumph was hailed as a deliverance from the oppressive Persian rule, though apparently it did not greatly affect conditions in Jerusalem. Josephus records with satisfaction Alexander's visit to the temple in the high priesthood of Jaddua, whose name is the last one mentioned by the Chronicler.[12] That event was regarded as in some measure a compliment to the Jewish faith, and in acknowledgment it was reported that every Jewish boy born in the year of the conqueror's visit was given the name Alexander. Certainly it became a popular name among the Jews, as among others.[13] However, the Macedonian looked with equal favor on the Samaritan community at Gerizim and their edition of the Pentateuch, and gave them his approval.

After his early death in 323 B.C. his widely extended dominion fell into fragments which were later ruled by four of his commanders, Cassander (Macedonia), Lysimachus (Thrace), Seleucus (Syria and the East) and Ptolemy (Egypt). The ancient monarchies were swept away, and Greek dynasts took their places. The Ptolemies and Cleopatras of the later pre-Christian centuries had no connection with Egyptian rulers of classic times, though on the walls of the late temples like those at Dendara, Esneh and Abydos they portrayed themselves with the symbols and hieroglyphics of authentic Egyptian rulers. The political results of Alexander's campaigns were limited and of brief duration. But the cultural consequences were profound. The spread of the Greek language, literature, ideas and customs was immediate and revolutionary. A Greek civilization sprang up throughout the entire near east. Palestinian cities like Gaza, Ashdod, Askelon, Joppa, Apollonia and Ptolemais became centers of Greek influence. To the east of the Jordan the same culture spread. Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Gerasa (modern Jerash) and Philadelphia (modern Amman) were Hellenic towns with stadia, theatres, temples and libraries whose remains are the wonder and delight of the modern archeologist.

---

[12] Jos. *Ant.* XI, 8. 4, 5; Neh. 12:11. The late fragments in Isaiah and Zechariah, e.g. Isa. 24:14–16 and Zech. 9:1–8, are by some thought to refer to this period. It will be noticed that Josephus places the erection of the Samaritan temple at this time. This would seem to be much too late, but is in harmony with his attitude toward that community.

[13] Cf. Acts 4:6; 19:33.

This Greek atmosphere had a profound effect on the Jews, sensitive as they were to the cultural climate. Their numbers in all these Grecianized cities were large and increasing. The Jews in Egypt were already numerous. Alexandria came presently to be the second Jewish center. They pushed into northern Syria, and became an important element in the population of Antioch. Between the Grecianized states of Syria on the north and Egypt on the south Palestine was subjected to a constant inundation of Greek influences, prominent among which were the paganizing tendencies of the Greek pantheon with its Olympian deities, so completely in contrast with the stern monotheism and morality of essential Judaism.

In the wars that presently broke out between Syria and Egypt the tide of conflict rolled back and forth over Palestine, and that unfortunate country was alternately the possession of one and the other of these two kingdoms. It was therefore subject to the disturbances, political, economic, cultural and religious, which such a time of foreign dominance would involve. Jerusalem and neighboring districts were overrun by Ptolemy I. Soter in 320 B.C., and many Jews and Samaritans were taken as captives to Egypt.[14] The exactions of Joseph the tax gatherer, an unscrupulous Jew who secured the tax-farming rights under Ptolemy III. Euergetes (247–222 B.C.) were symptomatic of the disorders of the age. With the increasing Greek influence, a different civilization, a new ethic and a strange type of philosophic and religious speculation swept in, and rapidly divided the Jerusalem community into liberal and conservative schools, the former eager followers of the Greek ideas, and the latter the defenders of the laws and loyalties of Judaism. So rapid was the growth of the liberalizing movement that Greek institutions like the stadium, the theatre, the gymnasium and debating schools of philosophy were introduced in Jerusalem, and Jewish youth began to wear the Hermes hat and other garments of Greek fashion. The Hebrew language had long since given place to Aramaic, save as a classic, and the Hellenistic Greek was now superseding both. Numbers of Greeks came in from the neighboring regions, and to all appearance Palestine, which had seemed least likely to follow the universal drift toward Hellenism, was on the way to a complete abandonment of its Jewish traditions and faith.

---

[14] Aristeas says that the number deported reached 100,000, and Josephus puts it at 120,000.

In the contests between Egypt and Syria the advantage that lay at first with the former passed to the latter. The more conservative Jews favored the Ptolemies as tolerant and friendly. The radicals, desiring a strong Jewish nation, part of a great Hellenic empire, inclined to the Seleucid government in Antioch, the capital of Syria. The Ptolemies declined in power, and the victories of Antiochus III, the Great (224–187 B.C.) made him master of the entire region. The crisis which saved Judaism came in the reign of the usurper, Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, (176–164 B.C.). This king, insistent on the suppression of all forms of superstition and dissent from his Greek cultus — a resistance such as the stricter Jewish party represented — and encouraged by the liberal faction in the city, which he took to be the majority, instituted a reign of persecution and terror in Jerusalem against the faithful, suppressed the worship at the temple, defiled the sanctuary, set up a shrine to Zeus in the sacred area, and forbade circumcision and the worship of Jahveh. Onias III, the venerable and beloved high priest, was deposed and his brother Jason was appointed by Antiochus. In the orgy of bloodshed which ensued many to escape martyrdom also fled to Egypt. It seemed that the work of Nehemiah and Ezra was brought to complete frustration, and that the flame of Judaism was quenched as that of the Hebrew life had been extinguished in earlier years.

Yet this proved the salvation of the Jewish adventure. Antiochus totally underestimated the strength of Judaism. Its conflict with Hellenism was destined to give it a force and coherence which only hardship could inspire. Persecution united the hostile groups of Jews. In the moment when all seemed lost, deliverance came from a wholly unexpected quarter. Mattathias Asmon,[15] of the town of Modein a few miles from Jerusalem, a member of one of the minor priestly families, started a revolt against the Syrian power, and under the leadership of his son Judas, called the Hammer (Maccabee) this attempt at deliverance developed into a revolution in which Judas in a series of battles won victories over greatly superior Syrian armies, and gave the Jewish cause a real place in the sun. At first the Jewish scruples against Sabbath desecration gave Antiochus an advantage, and Jerusalem was entered and some of its defenders slain without resistance. Later these scruples were abandoned, though not without misgiving. The success of the Maccabean forces was an astonishment to the Syrians, whose armies were followed by slave merchants prepared to buy captive Jews for the slave markets.

The temple was purified and worship resumed (165 B.C.). This was the beginning of the recognized period of Maccabean power. The war passed into a fresh stage. It was begun in the interest of religious liberty. Many of the Jews asked nothing more than the privileges of their worship. Judas however was not willing to cease the conflict short of political independence. At this point ended the struggle for religion and began the effort to secure secular power.

While the severe measures of Antiochus unified Jewish sentiment to a marked degree, and prepared the way for the most brilliant chapter in Jewish history, there were exceptions. Many of the priestly aristocracy submitted and sought the favor of the persecutor. Onias the deposed high priest fled to Egypt and built a sanctuary at Leontopolis to assert his claims to the priesthood, and this drew many Jews from Jerusalem, and continued for several generations as a center of Jewish worship.[16] Many of the people, alarmed at the issue raised by the Asmonean family, took refuge in the wilderness, and only changed this passive resistance to a more aggressive attitude as they witnessed the success of the Maccabean movement. Antiochus died in 164 B.C., having seen most of his plans fail.[17] He had however fixed in the Jewish mind a definite and ineradicable anti-foreign complex which led to serious and often tragic results in later periods. Racial calamities have often proved the cause of racial pride and exclusiveness.

---

[15] According to Josephus (*Ant.* XII. 6. 1) his great-grandfather was called Hasmon, hence the family name of Hasmoneans or Asmoneans.

On the death of Judas in the battle of Eleasa (161 B.C.) the leadership passed to his brother Jonathan who joined the high priesthood to his military activities. With Simon (143–135 B.C.), the third of the famous Asmonean brothers, came still greater honors. He was made commander, ethnarch and high priest, and the year 170 of the Seleucid era (143–142 B.C.) became the first year of the Hasmonean dynasty. Coins were struck bearing his name, and documents were dated in terms of the new chronology. He brought the Jewish community to a high level of prosperity. Perhaps his most notable achievement was the capture of the citadel of Jerusalem, which since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes had remained in Syrian hands. This was the last of the strongholds of Judea to yield, and it fell in 142 B.C. The temple was beautified, and there was general rejoicing. Soon after an embassy was sent to Rome to obtain confirmation of the friendship sought by Judas and Jonathan with that dominant power. A generous gift was presented, and the covenant renewed. It was broad in its terms, warning the other nations against any unfriendly acts toward the Jews.

---

[16] A late portion of the book of Isaiah may contain a reference to this sanctuary (see Isa. 19:19).

[17] The story of the Maccabean struggle is told graphically in 1 Maccabees, chapts. 1–10; and in the book of Daniel there is a somewhat slighting reference to it as "a little help" (9:34) which would hint at a date too early for the full significance of the movement to have been appreciated. The entire book is however a detailed though cryptic account of the great persecution and the career of Antiochus.

Unfortunate as was this Maccabean policy of alliance with Rome, and fatal as it proved in the sequel, it appeared to Judas and his successors the wisest policy in their contest with Syria. In spite of its unhappy results in the later entanglement of Jerusalem with Rome, it gave the Jews in many lands a place in the regard of the Roman world, which was the total world known to the historian of that age. Never since has any political power been in position to give to the Jewish people a recognition of such dignity and breadth. The nearest approach has been the Balfour declaration in our own time — a declaration limited however to the good offices of one European nation, and complicated by many involvements of a modifying character. All the more tragic therefore were the circumstances which precipitated the inevitable conflict with Rome, and blasted the early promise of Jewish nationality. For in slightly more than two centuries the Roman power which had given the Jews their charter of rights and their introduction to the family of states, wiped out their national existence and sent them forth from a ruined capital to wander homeless and undesired through the lands and the centuries, the victims of one of the greatest misadventures in history.

The murder of Simon by his son-in-law, Ptolemy, governor of Jericho, was a serious disaster to the state. But the failure of the plot to include John, his son, spared this able leader for a notable career. He is known to history as John Hyrcanus (135–105 B.C.), and he ruled over a kingdom greater than that of David. In spite of the fact that the Maccabees sprang from a minor priestly family, if indeed they were even of Levitical stock, John was confirmed in the high priesthood, following in this regard the position of Jonathan and Simon. It was the period of Judah's greatest glory. The nation was independent. Rome was friendly. An extensive program of conquest was projected. Judah, which had contributed so many thousands of her people to Egypt and other states as hired or enforced mercenary soldiers, was now hiring foreign troops to help in the subjugation of neighboring peoples. The Idumeans on the south and east were forcibly incorporated in the state and converted to Judaism.[18] This introduction of Idumean elements in wholesale numbers proved the undoing of the Maccabean dynasty, for from that group came the Herods, who displaced the Hasmonean line. Many other areas were overrun, and their population added to the numbers of proselytes. In 129 B.C. the hated Samaritan temple on Mt.

---

[18] Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 9. 1.

Gerizim was destroyed, and Samaria was again reduced to ruins, though the community of the Samaritans in Shechem (Nablous) persisted.

Meantime there grew up in Jerusalem various parties or groups whose differing attitudes toward the religious and political movements of the time marked them off as rival aspirants for leadership. The rise of the Maccabean patriots with their heroic defense of the Torah attracted to their enterprise those whose chief interest was the loyal observance of the laws emphasized by Ezra and his generation. Gradually these devoted men acquired the name of "puritans" or Pharisees. They were not particularly hopeful of any military or political revolution as promising the realization of their ideals, but were convinced rather that the study, observance and expansion of the law would prove the means of securing the divine favor and the prosperity of the holy community. The Hasmonean enterprise furnished the most energetic token of revived interest in religion in a time of deep depression, and for this reason such men gave it at first their approval, though they did not share its military hopes and had little faith in its immediate success. Their enthusiasm was enlisted by its early loyalty to the ideals of a godly community.

Later on, as the Maccabean leaders joined the high priesthood to their other honors, the Pharisees lost interest and turned afresh to the elaboration of the laws of holiness and the growing apocalyptic hopes. They were little enamoured of the splendors of a liturgy and the ostentation of a political order. For this reason, among others, they were held in higher esteem by the people generally, and were actually the religious leaders of the times. They were students of the entire collection of the sacred books, they held the doctrine of the future life and of angels, in both of which may be discerned something of the influence of the Zoroastrian faith which had spread to the west under Persian administration. Along with these beliefs came the tendency to messianic hopes, which played so important a part in the current and subsequent literature of Judaism.

The Sadducees on the other hand took their name from the priestly tradition of Zadok, and formed the party insistent upon the temple services and the importance of the liturgical side of religion. They came to be the possessors of the profitable temple franchises for the sale of sacrificial animals and the exchange of the temple currency used for tithes. Their numbers included the priestly groups with their various orders of high priest, ordinary priests, Levites, nethinim and the like, and as the later Hasmoneans and the Herods appointed men to the chief priestly offices without regard to their origin or Levitical legitimacy, the tradition of Aaronic blood must have become increasingly attenuated in the later years of the Jewish state. Though representing the official interest in religion, they were more concerned with secular than with religious affairs, and were to all intents a political party, only slightly interested in the minutiae of legal observances. Like the Samaritans they limited their recognition of scripture to the Pentateuchal writings, and discovering in them no doctrine of the future life or of angels, they rejected these elements of the popular faith. All oral traditions by means of which the Pharisees were busily expanding the written law were by them rejected. They did not share the antipathy to Greek ideas which was the natural result of the Maccabean movement, and which was characteristic of the Pharisees. They rather prided themselves on their broad-minded, tolerant attitude toward world culture, and their superiority to the scruples of their rivals.

The traditional contest between the two parties had its significance in the claim of the Sadducees to an aristocracy of Zadokite descent, however fanciful might be this "priestly nobility," while the Pharisees held to a "nobility of learning," denoting an aristocracy of the mind, based on knowledge of the law, to which the uninstructed, "this people that knoweth not the law," and was therefore accursed, had no admission.[19] The Maccabean rulers were wise enough to hold aloof, for the most part, from actual adherence to either of these parties, though their preference for one or the other was often evident. They would naturally be sensitive to the importance of the Pharisees as popular leaders, yet they recognized the official prestige of the Sadducees as the priestly group, and in holding the office of high priest they were in a measure obligated to this faction. Closely related to the Pharisees in interest were the scribes. They claimed Ezra as the first of their order [20] and devoted themselves to the activities connected with the reproduction, the interpretation and the expansion of the law. Naturally they were adherents of the Pharisees, though there were likewise Sadducean scribes. The importance of the scribes in the educational and religious life of the Jewish community finds many illustrations in the New Testament.

---

[19] John 7:49.

[20] Ezra 7:6.

The Essenes constituted still another group which probably took form in this period. They were a semi-monastic order, living in communities in isolated districts like the ravines of the Jordan valley, and cultivating the holy life with many rules of purity that suggest ancient Semitic as well as later non-Jewish sources.[21]

As the territory of Jewish life widened, and the difficulty of centering all worship at the temple increased, a new institution took form, called into being by the same needs that had multiplied the local sanctuaries in Hebrew days. This was the synagogue, whose Greek name makes evident the period in which it arose. The synagogue was a popular and democratic place of worship, in which no priestly rites such as sacrifice were performed, but public reading of the scriptures and sermons or exhortations by suitable leaders were the order of Sabbath observance, and there was usually a school in connection. How old this institution may have been it is impossible to say, but references in late psalms indicate the existence of synagogues in Persian days.[22]

One of the traditions of later Judaism related to an assembly called the Great Synagogue, which was supposed to have been organized by Ezra and continued through the years as a school or council of elders to decide upon questions relating to the collection of the sacred books, their interpretation and other matters of importance. This tradition regarding such a body was late and largely fanciful. There was no doubt some sort of council that grew up in Maccabean days whose functions were both academic and political.

---

[21] Josephus devotes considerable attention to the Essenes. Cf. *Ant.* XV. 10. 5 and *Jewish War* I. 3. 5; II. 7. 3; 8. 5, 11.

[22] E.g. Ps. 74:8.

On the one side it developed into the rabbinical schools such as those at Jerusalem and later at Jamnia, Tiberias and Safed, especially after the Roman war,[23] and on the other into the ruling body known as the Sanhedrin, largely a priestly organization, whose presiding officer was the high priest.[24] This body was the local city council in Jerusalem, discharging the functions of a governing group and court of justice, but subject to the Roman authority in capital cases and matters that affected the state. It is first mentioned by Josephus in the time of Herod,[25] and passed away with the fall of the city in 70 A.D. The tradition of a body called the Great Synagogue, whose activities were scholarly and whose decisions were regarded as final, is late and unreliable. It reads back the scribal activities of later talmudic schools into Maccabean days. It is thought that the celebrated Rabbi Akiba was the founder of the tradition.[26]

John Hyrcanus was succeeded by his son, Aristobulus, who added the title of king to that of high priest, thus abandoning all pretense of lineal relation of royalty to the house of David, as the claim of Aaronic descent had been largely forgotten in the case of the priesthood. The regions of Iturea and Galilee were added to Jewish territory at this time, and the people were forcibly subjected to the rite of circumcision.[27] After a brief reign of a single year he was followed by Alexander Jannaeus in 104 B.C. The vicious character and turbulent disposition of this man kept the nation in turmoil, external and civil, during most of his reign of a quarter of a century. The disgrace which he brought upon the office of high priest was a constant offense to the Pharisees, and though he added many of the Greek cities to his territory, he brought the Maccabean name to its lowest level and the state to almost complete secularization.

---

[23] The temple school at Jerusalem was apparently a college for the instruction of scribes and other teachers, and its members constituted a scholarly group in which religious questions could be discussed. In these respects it possessed the dual functions of a modern theological school. Cf. John 2:46.

[24] Cf. Matt. 26:57–60; Mark 14:55, 60; 15:1; Luke 22:66; Acts 4:5, 6, 15; 5:21, 27, 34, 41; 6:12, 15; 22:30; 23:1–9.

[25] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 10. 4.

[26] See the Jewish Encyclopedia, 11, p. 640.

[27] Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 11. 3.

During the rule of his widow, Alexandra (78–69 B.C.), the Pharisees came into recognized power, but although reforms were instituted, particularly in the area of education, the evil results of the previous years remained and increased. Hyrcanus II, the weak son of Alexander Jannaeus, and his younger but abler brother Aristobulus now contended for the kingdom, while the Roman power under Pompey was gradually taking possession of Judea, and the last remnants of the glorious Maccabean dynasty disappeared. The unhappy results of the appeal to Rome by Judas and Jonathan were revealed: Judea became a Roman province. The independence which the Jews enjoyed for a brief and brilliant moment came to an end. The title of ethnarch replaced that of king and passed from Jewish into Edomite hands. Pompey profaned the temple by his intrusion into its mysteries, and the romance of those early patriots of Modein, Beth-horon and Emmaus vanished in the deepening twilight of a subjugated province. The period of Jewish independence had lasted only eighty years (142–63 B.C.).

Two sinister names now appeared for the first time on the records of Judea — those of Rome and the Idumean Herods, names destined to leave lengthening shadows over the history. In his extension of the Roman power to the east, Pompey entered Syria in the year 66 B.C. and in the following year besieged and conquered Jerusalem, whose walls were demolished, though the temple was left standing.[28] This conquest of the city was attended by the slaughter of a multitude of the inhabitants, one of the many massacres that have befallen this unhappy place. Many others of the people were taken to Rome, and formed the nucleus of the large Jewish colony later settled there. This established the Roman rule in Palestine, though the weak Hyrcanus II now a Roman vassal continued as nominal king and high priest, with his nephews Alexander and Antigonus as rival claimants for the titles.

His prime minister was a certain Antipas or Antipater, an Idumean or Edomite, whose clan had been driven into Judah by the Nabateans of Petra[29] and absorbed into the population. This man, who was the father of Herod the Great, was later provided with a Hebrew pedigree by accommodating Jews who were sensitive regarding a foreign king on the throne of Jerusalem.[30] Antipater by his ability, and the favor in which he stood with Hyrcanus and Pompey, came to be a man of importance in Judea, and was presently made procurator of the province. He appointed his older son, Phasael, governor of Jerusalem, and his second son, Herod, governor of Coele-Syria and Galilee. After Pompey's death, Antipater aligned himself with Julius Caesar and secured his favor by numerous services. This was of advantage to the people, whose nominal ruler Hyrcanus was declared hereditary high priest and ethnarch, and in other ways Caesar's attitude was favorable to the Jews, who mourned his death. The murder of Antipater by servants of Hyrcanus did not break the hold his house had secured on the land, for he had proved himself stronger than either the king, Hyrcanus, or the two contenders for the throne, his nephews Alexander and Antigonus.

---

[28] Tacitus, *History*, V. 9.

[29] Isa. 63:1–6 may refer to this expulsion of Edomites and the attending massacres.

[30] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 1. 3; cf. Godbey, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

Herod and Phasael were now the real masters of the land. In spite of a deputation of Jews sent to Rome to protest to Antony against their rule, they were confirmed as tetrarchs, and Hyrcanus was limited to the high priesthood. Herod attempted to increase his popularity by marrying Mariamne, granddaughter of Hyrcanus, whose connection with the Maccabean family brought him a measure of favor. Herod was a singular combination of ability, culture and cruelty. He crushed the robbers in Galilee, and paid his share of the heavy tribute laid on the land by Crassus, after Caesar's death. But he was distrusted and hated by the Jews, whose most revered leaders he defied and affronted. During an invasion of the Parthians he was a fugitive, but later, by the favor of Antony, Octavius and the Roman senate, he completed the conquest of Palestine by the capture of Jerusalem with terrible slaughter of the people after a siege of five months. The last of the Maccabean claimants to power was put to death, and Herod was recognized by Antony as king of Judea[31] (37 B.C.).

---

[31] Tacitus, *op. cit.*, V. 9. Herod's wives and their children were as follows: Doris (Antipater); Mariamne (Herod Philip); Malthaca of Samaria (Antipas, Archelaus, Olympias); Cleopatra of Jerusalem (Herod and Philip); Pallas (Phasaelus); Phedra (Roxana); Elpis (Salome).

His reign of more than thirty years was marked by singular ability in military affairs, so that his domain equalled the most extensive Palestinian dominion of the past. He constructed fortresses, not only in Jerusalem (the walls, the tower of Antonia, his own palace and the temple, all of which were military defenses) but as well in Samaria (Sebaste), Caesarea, Straton's Tower and Hesbon east of the Jordan. He took deep interest in the architectural enrichment of his kingdom through the erection of costly structures, statues and other public ornaments.

He promoted the culture of the country on Greek and Roman lines. His purposes resembled those of Antiochus Epiphanes, nearly a century and a half before, though he was less inclined to disturb religious conditions than the Syrian king. He was content to allow the people to pursue their cultus, though he must have offended the godly by the secularization of common life, and the introduction of heathen seductions, such as races, gladiatorial fights and the pagan theatre. His chief purpose was the attaining of power, and he was ruthless as to the means he used. He was impulsive and despotic. His spies lurked everywhere to bring him reports that were often the basis of erratic and vindictive punishments. His policy was one of terrorization. Knowing he was hated of all but his favorites he lived in constant suspicion, and even his most intimate friends were never trusted. His two objectives were his own unquestioned and despotic power and the favor of Rome. He understood that his Roman masters wished to promote Hellenism in the empire, and he was active in furthering this movement not only in Jerusalem but in the other cities of Palestine, both west and east of the Jordan.

A policy of this order naturally offended the men of religious conviction. Herod became the object of increasing aversion on the part of the Pharisees. Even the costly and beautiful temple which he erected as the national sanctuary could compensate the pious but little for the secularization and degradation of morals and religion. The Sadducees were almost equally disturbed, for although their order composed the priestly aristocracy, and to them fell the profits of the temple traffic, yet Herod's arbitrary shifting of the high priestly office from one incumbent to another, without regard even to the pretense of Levitic regularity, rendered him increasingly hateful to the real lovers of the Torah and the temple.

That building was indeed the object of pride to every Jew. It represented the most elaborate attempt made by the king to placate his offended subjects. It was begun in his fifteenth year and required more than ten years to build. In fact further work went on until 64 A.D., almost within the shadow of its final destruction.[32] It was erected on the site of the temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel, and a portion of the latter structure had to be demolished to make room for it. A section of its outer inclosure is now exposed, and constitutes the so-called Wailing Wall on the western side of the harem site. It was a sanctuary, a market, a school and a fortress combined, and was the last structure save the upper city to be taken by the Romans in 70 A.D.

The final days of Herod's rule were a reign of terror to the nation, the city, his officials and his family. His brother-in-law, Aristobulus, had been drowned at Jericho, at his command. Two of his sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, were murdered at Samaria by his orders. The aged high priest and ex-king, Hyrcanus, met the same fate. His adored wife, Mariamne, of whom he was insanely jealous, fell a victim to his madness, and her mother died with her. Antipater, a surviving son, was executed five days before the tyrant's death, and two distant relatives of Hyrcanus were killed in the same ruthless way, that the last of Maccabean blood might be destroyed. Knowing the execration in which he was held, in a burst of fury he ordered the massacre of the principal men of the city as soon as he should die, that there might be a genuine cause for grief at his death. Fortunately this ghastly command was not carried out. But the whole city rejoiced when the news of his end was announced.

---

[32] Cf. John 2:20. Jos. *Ant.* XC. 11. 1–6.

Thus came to its sombre close the career of this brilliant soldier, ambitious ruler, insatiable builder, clever politician, conscienceless egotist and bloody monster, Herod, miscalled the Great. And at that very time (4 B.C.) in Nazareth a village in Galilee a young child whom the king in alarm had tried to add to the list of his victims, was beginning a career which was destined to change the course of history.

During this period of the beginning and first stage in the era of Judaism a considerable literature took form. Due to the fact that Nehemiah and Ezra, the founders of the Jewish community in Jerusalem, were Hebrews from the east, and that the new community was built on the site of the ancient capital of David's kingdom, the writings produced in the early years were in the Hebrew language, in which the classic literature of ancient Israel had been recorded, and which was held in reverence as the historic and sacred tongue of the land. It was a disappearing speech. The people of the province were using a later, commercial language known as Aramaic, or the confused patois of the neighboring tribes.[33] But the cultural influence and authority of the language of prophets, priests and psalmists of the past was sufficient to fix the pattern of literary work in the Hebrew form, at least for a generation or two. As Latin continued to be the language of scholarship in Italy long after it had ceased to be the speech of the people, so in Judah the men of priestly or prophetic spirit who wrote at all employed the language of the past.

The number of such literary productions was small in the new community; at least few have survived from that era. The interests of the province were too serious and pressing to encourage extensive authorship. A few documents however have remained as witnesses to the intellectual and religious activities of the age. Of these the earliest and one of the most important, a true beginning of Jewish literature, is the journal of Nehemiah,[34] which the Chronicler later used as the nucleus of his narrative of this period. It is the graphic and straightforward recital in the first person of the events which led to the courageous and sacrificial work of the great chamberlain in rescuing Jerusalem from oblivion, and organizing the beginnings of Jewish life.[35] The journal of Ezra, or the portion of the Chronicler's document which refers to Ezra's ministry in the first person,[36] purports to be a first-hand record of the work of that leader. If such were the case, it would be a document of great significance in its description of events connected with the introduction of the Priest Code, and the reforms then attempted. Its literary characteristics however are so largely those of the Chronicler himself that the judgment of scholars inclines to the opinion that it is the product of the Chronicler's own pen, and its date the last part of the fourth century or the early years of the third B.C. Certain it is that the atmosphere, vocabulary and assumptions of the Chronicler's age are distinguishing features of this section as of the other portions of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah.

---

[33] Neh. 13:23, 24.

[34] Neh. 1:1–7:73a. This document probably belongs to the end of the fifth century B.C.

[35] See page 138.

The Third Isaiah[37] and the book of Joel seem to have come from the early part of the fourth century. They give vivid impressions of the difficulties confronting the province, such as the rivalry of the Samaritan community, the prevalence of pagan practices among the citizens of Jerusalem, the struggle of the faithful to maintain the ideals of their leaders, and the divine warnings embodied in such visitations as the locust plague. The growing antagonism toward the neighboring clans, as disclosed in Joel, makes evident a sense of superiority and disdain on the part of an increasing section of the population. Certain of the psalms reflect the political and social hardships of this age, to which reference has already been made. The most notable of the literary products of the fourth century was the book of Job, a work of apologetic intent, undertaking in the form of an elaborate poetic debate to justify the divine providence in

[36] Ezra 7:27–9:15.

[37] Isaiah, chapts. 56–66.

the misfortunes which had befallen the community. The evidences of Edomite background and influence in the work afford further indication of the important part the men of that infusion were taking in the affairs of Judea.

Two brief works of the end of the Persian or the beginning of the Greek age reveal the growing cleavage between the insular sentiments of the legalists and the more hospitable attitude of those of the prophetic spirit. These are the books of Ruth and Jonah, both works of fiction and both set in the framework of the distant past, but manifestly intended as tracts for the time to protest against the increasing antipathy manifested by the conservatives against non-Jews. The theme of Ruth is the loyalty and nobility of a Moabite woman, and her place in the ancestral line of David. Jonah holds up to censure the ungracious and bigoted nationalism of an alleged prophet of Jahveh whose hostility to a heathen city is set in contrast with the divine compassion.

Somewhere in the period between 330 and 250 B.C. the triple document, Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, would seem to fall. Its general characteristics and motives have been discussed already. It remains only to observe that the intent of the author to record his own understanding of the origin and early stages of Judaism becomes increasingly clear as his narrative proceeds. His sources are the prophetic books of Samuel-Kings with valuable additions from other hands. His assumption is that the Mosaic institutes have been in force from the beginnings of Hebrew life, and that the present Jewish community is continuous with the Hebrew nation of the past. To convey this impression he insists that the majority of the survivors of the siege of Jerusalem in

586 B.C. were conveyed to Babylon, and that upon the accession of Cyrus the Persian in 538 a great company of these exiles returned to Palestine and rebuilt the city. Further, that with Ezra and Nehemiah came other important companies of Hebrew stock, and that the revived community in Judea was thus in direct descent from the historic Israel. In proof of this theory the Chronicler employs genealogical lists, in whose contrivance or use he makes clear his skill. The reasons for regarding this thesis as lacking in validity have been set forth in a former chapter.[38] It is unnecessary to assume that there was deliberate deception on the Chronicler's part. He wrote at a time long after the beginnings of the Jewish state, and the account given by him had doubtless become the accepted tradition. Such assumed connection with an honorable past is the natural craving of any self-conscious people, and has many illustrations in history.

To the early part of the third century belongs the book of Canticles, or the Song of Songs, a charming collection of love and marriage lyrics. The influence of the Aramaic language was already manifesting itself in literary style and vocabulary, and is particularly marked in the book of Koheleth, strangely named Ecclesiastes, which reflects the speculative spirit of the early Greek age with its humanistic and universalistic tendencies, when Jerusalem was yielding to the fascinations of Hellenic philosophy. In this work the prevailing pessimism of the age is displayed, and the practice of using an ancient authority (Solomon in this case) as the assumed author is illustrated. A more constructive work is the Wisdom of Solomon, written in Greek, and worthy of a place in the canon. Doubtless such would have been its assignment if its Hebrew spirit had been clothed in Hebrew words. In it the greatness of Judaism is proclaimed.

---

[38] See pages 135 ff.

The large and growing Jewish population in Egypt, with whom Greek had become the literary language, could no longer read the Hebrew scriptures, and needed a version for its synagogues and schools. In the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 250 B.C., such a translation of the extant books of the Old Testament was undertaken by Jewish scholars, and gradually completed in the course of a generation or two. From the tradition that seventy learned men were chosen for the task it acquired the name of The Seventy (Septuagint or LXX). This was the first translation of the scriptures, and was the Bible of the widely scattered Jews of Jesus' day and of the early Christians.

To the first years of the second century B.C. probably belongs the romance of Esther, written in Hebrew and reflecting the intense hatred of non-Jews felt by a portion of the community, along with curious indifference to names of heathen divinities borne by Jews, such as Mordecai (Marduk) and Esther (Ishtar). Six additional chapters form a Greek appendix to the book.[39] Of proximate date is the Hebrew text of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, an admirable volume of reflections upon morals and religion. It was translated into Greek by the author's grandson about the year 132 B.C., and is one of the most valuable portions of the Apocrypha.

The singular type of writing known as apocalyptic took form in the period following the rise of Judaism. It was an effort by means of symbols and figurative language to convey to the faithful a measure of encouragement in the dark days of persecution, such as that waged by Antiochus. Emphasis was placed on the certainty of early supernatural deliverance from present troubles. It was a cryptic form of writing in which impending political and social movements were forecast in terms of catastrophic events, or in the forms of animals, usually composite and mythical. It made extensive use of angels, sacred numbers, colors, etc. It was a type of verbal picture-writing, undertaken by people who conceived themselves forbidden to employ the art patterns of portraiture or the representation of any order of animal life. The vivid figures of speech and parabolic manner of teaching employed by prophets like Zephaniah and Ezekiel may have suggested a still further use of picture language, coupled with the purpose to restrict to the initiated the meaning of the messages conveyed. Apocalyptic in its true form is found only among Jewish and Jewish-Christian writers of the period from 200 B.C. to 100 A.D., although works patterned on this model but of less significance, continued to appear in later periods of Judaism.

---

[39] Chapters X–XVI, found in the Apocrypha.

In the second and third sections of Zechariah examples of this literary form are found. But the books of Enoch and Daniel are the most outstanding instances of its use. In both cases an ancient worthy is chosen as the mouthpiece of the author's message. This type of pseudographic composition is characteristic of the entire series of apocalyptic works. In the book of Enoch there are several sections dating apparently from different periods, but all concerned with the fortunes of the Jewish people and their future. The background is the Syrian persecution of 175–164 B.C. Similar, though more concrete and vivid, is the message of the book of Daniel, whose language is partly Hebrew and partly Aramaic. Here the venerable figure of the prophet Daniel is employed in a series of stories illustrative of courage and loyalty to the law, and a series of visions dealing directly with the current distress and with the Syrian king, under the guise of the Babylonian Nebuchadrezzar, whose name in the later books of the Old Testament is given the form Nebuchadnezzar. The closing chapters give a long and detailed account of Jewish experiences up to the author's time in the guise of prediction.

The book of Jubilees (often called "Little Genesis") was written in Hellenistic Greek, about the beginning of the first century B.C., and reviewed the story of the world from creation to Sinai in the spirit of Pharisaism. It was a defense of Judaism, its ordinances and traditions, and suggests the early phases of talmudic comment. To the first century before Christ belong the Psalms of Solomon, a collection of eighteen Pharisean utterances directed chiefly against the Sadducees, and voicing in an exalted tone the messianic hope of the time.

Tobit and Judith are Jewish romances depicting phases of Jewish beliefs and traditions. The two books of Maccabees deal with the Jewish uprising against the Syrian power, and the heroic exploits and sufferings of its heroes. Probably 1 Maccabees was written in Hebrew, but it has been preserved only in the Greek form. Greek additions to the book of Daniel, such as Bel and the Dragon, Susanna, and the Song of the Three Holy Children, are found in the

Apocrypha. To the same age, in the first century B.C., belong the book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremy. Some of the psalms in the book that bears that name come from periods as late as the Maccabean revolution.

With these varied characteristics and experiences Judaism came to its most distinct and conspicuous expression in the days when Jesus of Nazareth was preparing for his ministry. Only the most prophetic mind could perceive the presence of forces that would soon bring that vigorous political and social institution, the Jerusalem community, to its tragic and untimely end.

VIII

JEW AND CHRISTIAN

Biblical literature presents in two impressive chapters the early story of monotheistic religion. The first of these chapters relates to the Hebrew people, with whom monotheism came first to realization after centuries of struggle. It includes all the writings of the Old Testament down to the close of the Hebrew state and the virtual cessation of the prophetic function. Broadly this means the documents that were written in Hebrew, although some of the late books in the collection were still written in that tongue after the beginning of the Jewish period.

The second chapter deals with the three daughter faiths which inherited immediately or more remotely the Hebrew tradition. These were in their order Samaritanism, Judaism and Christianity. The first of these, although it issued directly from the Hebrew organization and survived as a fragment of its life at the collapse of the kingdom of Israel in 721 B.C., was limited to the territory contiguous to Samaria, produced little literature of value, and continues as a small and diminishing group today.

Judaism, the product of the notable activities of Nehemiah and Ezra, took form in the fifth century B.C., developed into a strong and influential state under the Maccabees, produced a significant body of institutions and literature, but met its complete political overthrow in the shattering calamity of the Roman war and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Far from destroying them however this tragedy dispersed the Jews into the entire Graeco-Roman world and beyond, and stimulated a loyalty to Jewish institutions which has continued through the centuries, and is today the characteristic token of Judaism in all lands.

In the first century of the present era a third movement grew up in Palestine, whose ideals were rooted in the ancient Hebrew life, whose background and foil was Judaism, and whose founder was the Galilean teacher and prophet, Jesus of Nazareth.

In the biblical sources the references to the Samaritans are infrequent though occurrent both in the Old Testament and the New. The Jewish people and their institutions are the theme, and they furnished the authors, of the later literature of the Old Testament, some of it in the classic Hebrew, some in Aramaic, and some in Hellenistic Greek; while constant reference is made to them in the New Testament as forming the environment of the nascent Christian community. The New Testament is the collection of writings which grew up around the life of Jesus and the early church. Most of its writers were Jewish Christians. The Bible thus embraces in these two somewhat overlapping chapters the total surviving literature of the Hebrew race, most of the early writings of the Jewish people, and that section of primitive Christian records which the early church regarded as of greatest authority among its rapidly growing documents.

The rise of Judaism was the salvation of monotheism and of ethical religion. Although the Hebrew records, embodying the messages of prophets, priests and psalmists, had been carried by departing refugees and emigrants from Palestine into various regions after the collapse of Hebrew institutions, and although these expatriates carried in their hearts a measure of loyalty to the past, there was little prospect that the ideals which had found utterance and expression in Palestine, and particularly in Judea, would become more than locally normative in any part of the world. The resolute purpose of Nehemiah to found a new colony on the ancient site of Jerusalem, and to gather in such members of that and other communities as should offer themselves for the new adventure, was the fresh starting point in the worship of the God of Israel.

The gathered populace of the new town represented many clans and cults, probably most of them polytheistic. But the very novelty of the conception of one deity in an area where one world ruler, the Persian king, held sway, together with the increasingly ornate ritual of the temple service and its elaborate code of laws, proved sufficiently attractive to launch the new community on a promising career. It was a critical hour in the history of religion. In the long perspective of the centuries it is plain that it was a matter of life or death. Jerusalem might have accepted the religion and ethical pattern of Susa or Damascus or Athens or Rome, and the rich inheritance left from the days of Amos and Isaiah would have been lost. In that case, so far as the student of world events can discern, there would have been no Judaism and no Christianity. In a very true sense those men who builded the walls of Jerusalem in the fifth century B.C. held the future in their keeping, and were shaping the religion of humanity.

It was probably inevitable that the new community, in whose area all semblance of monarchy had been swept away by repeated tragedies, should readily adapt itself to priestly control. The laws promulgated by Ezra, the co-founder of the state and the actual organizer of Judah's constitution, gave to the priests the supreme place in the social order. Claiming direct descent from the priesthood of Hebrew times, these men held undisputed control not only of religious but of secular affairs. There was danger in this, as there always is in uncontested ecclesiastical power. As viewed by an increasing company of the devout, their order became a menace to the spirit of religion, largely exhausting their interests apparently in the observances of the sanctuary. Hence there grew up the contest between the Sadducees, the priestly class, and the men devoted to the study and elaboration of the law, the Pharisees. Probably this controversy was of real value to the religious life of the age. Just as the antagonism between priests and prophets in ancient Israel brought a wholesome freshening to the thought of their time, so the give-and-take of the disputes between Sadducees and Pharisees was of value to Judiasm.

During the period preceding the Maccabean uprising there were many vicissitudes of fortune in the province. Judah had lost its tradition of royalty and was in reality a congregation. While the temple was the picturesque center of its worship, the synagogue was the ordinary and popular expression of its faith, and the pattern of its thinking and its social life. It provided not only an institution for public worship, but a stimulus to the study of the law. The activities of the scribes were gradually elaborating the legal rules for personal and domestic behavior, and in this pursuit the more devoted members of the community found their refuge from current evils and their hope for better days. To men of the Pharisean leaning the knowledge of the law — the Torah of Moses, with its growing fringe of commentation — was the secret of piety. In the troubled times through which they were passing the observance of minute regulations of daily conduct afforded genuine comfort to the devout. If the prescriptions of the Torah as interpreted by the scribes seemed at times trivial, who was to judge between the great and the small as viewed by the Eternal? Certain it is that in all ages of Judaism since its beginnings, life under the law has brought to multitudes of Jews a peace and happiness which enabled them to endure hardships otherwise unendurable. It was not strange that the Pharisees, devoted as they were to the scholarly labors which centered in the scriptures, enjoyed the confidence and reverence of the common people to a degree unapproached by any other class.

The Maccabean struggle in the second century B.C. gave fresh vitality to Judaism, oppressed as it was by foreign control, poverty and declining enthusiasm. The effort to force upon Judah a Hellenistic culture, already prevalent and attractive, roused the faithful to desperate courage, and saved afresh the religion of the one God. The pious champions of the law flocked to the Maccabean standard, and set themselves to revive the neglected or threatened Jewish rites. New feasts like Purim and Khanuka[1] were added to the calendar. The Hasmonean heroes became the objects of almost idolatrous regard. The high priesthood was given new dignity, and presently was added to the official honors of the rulers. It was thereby made at once more splendid and more worldly. The Maccabean kings gradually changed the religious community of Nehemiah and Ezra into a secular state. The Sadducean party, with its temple connections and perquisites, became the ruling group, the new aristocracy.

---

[1] The Feast of Lights, commemorating the rededication of the temple in 165 B.C.

These events aroused in Pharisean circles alarm and resentment. Disillusioned by the tendencies in church and state, they withdrew more and more from support of the government and found refuge in fresh devotion to the Torah, in messianic hopes for the coming of a righteous king and in apocalyptic forecasts. The breach between them and the Sadducees widened, and the controversies were increasingly bitter. Meantime the Council of Elders, the Sanhedrin, fell into the control first of one party and then the other, while the later Maccabean rulers wavered in their leanings toward the two groups. The common people, perplexed by the prevailing political and ecclesiastical polemics, were too frequently the victims of self-seeking leaders and delusive expectations.

It must not be supposed that the populace of Jerusalem and its suburbs was possessed of a common mind on any of the themes of politics or religion. From the first the citizenship of the Jewish state was of highly mixed character. Its varied elements were fused into a measurably common mold by the exciting experiences of the first years, and later by the thrilling events of the Maccabean revolution. But there were as many different types as would be found in an American city, whose people represent different racial stocks, industrial activities, moral levels and political prejudices. These varieties of interest find echoes in the literature of the period. Naturally those writings which reflect the deeper religious sentiments of the time have survived in the canonical and extra-canonical sources. They reveal the spiritual yearnings, the efforts to find comfort in prayer and meditations upon the scriptures, in fasting, almsgiving and the other pieties of synagogue and family, as a relief from the perplexities of life.

It is unfortunate that there is no outstanding character in all this period who represents Judaism. Great men there were, like Simon the Just, Judas the Hammer and the faithful and beloved Onias III. But none of these represents Judaism as Isaiah stands for the Hebrew age or Paul for Christianity. In other respects as well the Jew of that time suffered limitations. His art life was restricted by a law supposed to have come down from Moses forbidding the creation of statues or paintings as dangerous temptations to idolatry, and it was only in later centuries that he broke away from this prohibition, which shackles Islam even to the present. He took refuge therefore in the word-artistry which plays so conspicuous a part in the literature of apocalypse.

As the political hopes aroused by the Maccabean dynasty faded before the power of Rome, and gave place to apocalyptic expectations of an era of glory soon to be ushered in, there grew up in Jewish circles a passion for the missionary extension of their faith in the neighboring lands and throughout the Graeco-Roman world. Conscious of the immense superiority of their monotheistic belief and their high moral code to the paganism around them, they undertook an expansion of the area of Judaism which for a time was highly successful. At first this was political and territorial. The anti-foreign complex which was the result of Syrian persecution and the inroads of Hellenism gave way before the desire to open the doors of their religious life to the stranger. Successive invasions of Edom brought that people under Jewish control and under John Hyrcanus added great numbers to the confessors of the faith. Judas Aristobulus, his son, conquered Ituria and forced its people to submit to circumcision. Hebrew oracles were recalled predicting that men of other bloods would claim fellowship with the Jew.[2] Proselytes from other lands embraced the religion of the Torah. Izates, king of Adiabene, a district in Mesopotamia, adopted Judaism, and his mother Helena became a convert.

This evangelistic phase of the movement penetrated remote regions. Jews in the diaspora were sought out by missionaries from Jerusalem,[3] and strangers were given a welcome. In due time the propaganda took on a more intellectual phase, in which Jewish writers sought to interpret Judaism favorably to men of Greek culture and refute the charge that it was a recent provincial and bigoted religion.[4] Jesus commented on the efforts of the Jews to convert people to their faith.[5] The movement failed at last, both because of the growing disapproval of the leading

[2] Zech. 8:23.

[3] Ecclus. 31:9–11.

[4] This was the effort of Philo; also of the Sibylline oracles. See Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ,* Vol. IV.

[5] Matt. 23:15.

rabbis, who were disinclined to offer the high privileges of Judaism to the pagan world; and because of the evangelistic zeal and success of Christian missionaries.

Closely related to the general problem of proselytism was the growing cleavage between two types of thinking upon the subject of Judah's relation to the outer world of non-Jewish life. As far back as the days immediately following the Babylonian overthrow of Jerusalem devout Hebrews had pondered the matter. Did Israel exist for its own sake, and did its chief interest lie in the safeguarding and perpetuation of its own life and institutions, or did it have a mission to the wider world? Ezekiel was no narrow nationalist, and yet his chief concern seems to have been the restoration of the holy city, the temple and its ministries. The future of Israel was of supreme moment to him. Being of priestly stock, he prepared an expansion of the national institutes which, though never actually put into operation, served as a contribution to the more elaborate Priest Code on which Ezra based his drastic reforms. The impression made by the messages of Ezekiel is that of the incomparable value of Israel in the sight of Jahveh, and his supreme solicitude for its continuing welfare.

On the other hand a contemporary of Ezekiel's, perhaps the most impressive voice in the succession of prophets, the Second Isaiah, was of a different mind. Not less interested than his colleague in the revival of the nation, he had a wider vision of its duty and destiny. The classic oracle that discloses the heart of his appeal to his scattered brethren, but particularly to that mystic Servant of Jahveh, the devoted nucleus around which the dispersed Hebrews were to rally, is this: "It is too slight a thing for your being my servant that I should but raise up the tribes of Jacob; so I will make you a light of the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth."[6] This gave a new curve to the line of Israel's divine calling. It was to be a cosmic not a parochial task.

When the Jewish state was organized by its devoted founders, Nehemiah and Ezra, it was inevitable that the first of these divergent tendencies should have the right of way. The building up of a commonwealth on priestly foundations was the chief concern of these pioneers. To weld together the divergent elements in the new community, and give them a motive for existence and a pattern of conduct was of first importance. Neither the citizens nor the leaders of the new state were interested in philanthropies beyond their immediate limit. Their only solicitude regarding the wider groups was to add them as subjects or proselytes to the growing citizenship of Jerusalem. Furthermore, many of the experiences of the troubled years that followed sharpened the edge of aversion to the pagan world and fixed in the Jews a definite anti-gentile complex. They rightly regarded themselves as the moral and religious superiors of the rest of mankind. That mind-set found expression in such works as Joel, in Daniel and others of the apocalypses, and easily ran to the arrogant chauvinism of the book of Esther.

There were men of a different mood, however, who were dissatisfied with these unfriendly attitudes toward other nations, and made their protests in documents that have survived. The books of Ruth and Jonah are of this order, and they must have echoed the sentiments of a considerable minority in Jerusalem. In such writings one finds appreciation of neighboring peoples like Moab, and even heathen cities like Nineveh, commonly the subjects of invective in the prophetic and legal documents of the past. Of these two tendencies in the thinking of early Judaism, the former and narrower must have been much the stronger. The priestly party, the Sadducees, attached too much value to the ritual of the temple to admit the unholy heathen to their approval. The Pharisees, experts in the technicalities of the Torah, though far closer to the rank and file of the people than their rivals, arrogantly held themselves above the uninstructed mass.[7] Much more disdainful would be their attitude toward men of pagan breed. It is beyond question that this self-righteous bearing of Jewish leaders had much to do with the aversion in which the race came to be held in the thought of the Graeco-Roman world. That unfortunate and often unjust opinion is expressed by a number of the writers of the empire, like Tacitus, Horace and Livy.

---

[6] Isa. 49:6, Smith translation.

That men of broader and more appreciative spirit were found in the community is not to be doubted. It is proved by the books of friendly attitude already mentioned. It is indicated by the growing infusion of Persian ideas into Jewish thought, such as the Zoroastrian doctrines of angels and spirits, both good and evil, and the conception of a future life, quite foreign to the Hebrew mind. These suggestions from the religion of Cyrus and Darius may have been the result of direct contact with Persia, or may have fallen as seeds into the prepared soil of Jewish life. Certainly they appeared only in this and later periods, and even then were accepted by only a portion of the intellectual class.[8]

---

[7] "This multitude that knoweth not the law is accursed," John 7:49. This represented the scholarly and official disdain of the mere common herd of uninstructed people, the "am ha-aretz," the folk of the land.

These and other divergences of thought appeared in the life of the province. While the majority of the citizenship was probably unaffected by theological controversies and party differences, and pursued its way without undue disturbance, there were from time to time those who demanded liberty from foreign oppressors, or who stirred up rebellion against the rulers of the Maccabean line. The spirit of Palestine was never wholly quiet. In Roman days it was one of the most troublesome provinces in the empire, due to the passion for freedom that animated the people, particularly those of the Galilean area. In times of oppression, either by Persia, Syria or Rome, the messianic hope flamed in the hearts of impressionable Jews, and would-be messiahs were often proclaiming themselves as deliverers. Some of these abortive efforts at independence are mentioned in the Christian sources.[9]

In the midst of these many exciting movements, political, social, industrial and religious, which made the age one of ferment in Palestine, there arose a prophet whose person and message were destined to have a profound effect upon the times, and to inaugurate a far-reaching religious enterprise, perhaps the most notable in history. To a certain extent the popular agitation of the time was an advantage.

---

[8] The Sadducees, acknowledging, like the Samaritans, only the Pentateuch as authentic scripture, rejected the views mentioned (Cf. Luke 20:27, 37; Acts 23:8, etc.).

[9] Cf. Acts 5:36, 37; 21:38. See also pp. 264, 265.

The messianic hope animated many minds. Rome's rule of the land was measurably just, but it was militaristic, rigid, burdensome and contemptuous. From their proconsular headquarters in Caesarea the successive Roman governors ruled the country, granting to the sons of Herod the Great a nominal authority over the little provinces into which Palestine was divided. The ceremonial gatherings at Jerusalem, some of which were revivals of Hebrew customs and some of more recent origin, were occasions of anxiety to the administration, and the procurators usually brought up Roman troops to augment the Jerusalem garrison and guard against popular uprisings. There was a mood of unrest and expectancy among the people. The conflicts of the government with political and religious aspirants to leadership had been frequent and disturbing, and the party groups in the council of elders, or Sanhedrin, held no affection for the Roman administration.

At such a time Jesus or Joshua was born, some five or six years before the beginning of the present era, of parents named Joseph and Mary. Their home was in Nazareth, a town among the hills of Galilee. Tradition placed the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem[10] south of Jerusalem, but his boyhood and youth were spent in Nazareth, in which place and its vicinity he worked as an artisan with his father. Later he appears, as the oldest son, to have borne the responsibility of the family's support. There were younger brothers and sisters. The records relating to the life of Jesus are contained in four brief memoirs called the Gospels, and in references found in the writings of the apostle Paul. None of these documents presents a complete life of Jesus, nor do all the sources combined offer sufficient material for a satisfactory biography. They are rather tracts for the times. But they set forth the important facts in the life of Jesus with sufficient clearness and force to afford ample basis for the Christian message.[11]

---

[10] The narratives in Matthew, chapts. 1 and 2, and Luke, chapts. 2 and 3, relating to the genealogy and birth of Jesus appear to belong to a different body of material from the central Gospel sources, and it has been thought by some scholars that the Bethlehem story was an effort to conform the record to the passage in Micah (5:2; cf. Matt. 2:1–12).

Of the boyhood and youth of Jesus in Nazareth little is known, though some of the extra-canonical writings undertook to supply information relating to this period. It is probable that he had the usual Jewish schooling in the home and the synagogue school. Like other children he accompanied his parents to Jerusalem at the times of the yearly festivals there, and one incident is related of such a journey.[12] He was familiar with the scriptures of his people, and quoted them frequently in his later teaching.[13] He was a loyal Jew, a lover of his people and his country. There is no intimation that he ever journeyed to other lands, or came in contact with teachers of other religions, though fantastic claims to this effect have been advanced in recent years.[14] He spoke the Aramaic language of his people, and read it in the synagogue on at least one occasion, in the popular targum or translation.[15] He probably understood Hebrew to some extent, and may have had some acquaintance with the Hellenistic Greek into which the Old Testament had been rendered. But he had no technical training for the rabbiship such as was customary for the men of that order.[16] He lived the life of a normal, well-informed and efficient young man in his home city, and therefore on his return after an absence his fellow townsmen were surprised that he assumed the authority of a teacher.[17] They discovered that he was no mere provincial, even though he had not traveled abroad. He knew the world of his age, and was sensitive to those currents of public interest which came from Egypt, from the Orient, from Athens and Rome and crossed the plain below his hill town of Nazareth.

---

[11] Cf. John 20:30, 31; 21:25.

[12] Luke 2:41–51.

[13] He may have committed to memory the entire Old Testament, as many Jews of his day and later times have done. Moslems have a title (" hafiz ") for one who memorizes the entire Koran.

[14] See Goodspeed's *Strange New Gospels* for an exposé of these fraudulent assertions.

[15] Luke 4:16–20. The Pentateuch was read only from the Hebrew text

It was inevitable that one familiar with the lore of the ancient Hebrew race, acquainted with and proud of the story of his own people, the Jews, and sharing as he did their aspirations for political independence and a worthful national career, should be deeply disturbed by the unhappy conditions of the time and sympathetic with the apocalyptic hopes which forecast deliverance from the Roman yoke. He was likewise interested in the reformation of religious and social life and the coming of a new age in which the dreams of the prophets of old should come to realization.

Jesus was a conforming Jew, obedient to all the rules of the synagogue, and eager to have part in the attainment of

---

in the synagogue, but the remainder of the scriptures could be read from the vernacular version.

[16] This explains the comment of the Jews in John 7:15. He had never pursued a course of study at the university in Jerusalem.

[17] Matt. 13:57.

a better order of life for his community and his nation. How was it to be accomplished? Roman rule was increasingly burdensome. The temple worship was elaborate and costly, but apparently without effect upon the mass of the people, except to arouse protest regarding the outlay demanded for its support and the sordid traffic conducted in the temple markets. The Pharisees, the best men of the time, many of whom were models of saintliness, insisted that the remedy for the current evils lay in strict obedience to the Torah, and that if the whole law could be kept with scrupulous care even for a single day, the messianic hope would be realized, and the deliverer would come.[18] Many earnest souls, despairing of any human help, believed that nothing but a manifestation of divine power and wrath could avail, a catastrophic event which should bring to a close the present evil times. These men looked expectantly for the appearance of the messenger of God, the hoped-for minister of apocalyptic justice and deliverance.

Views of this character were forcibly expressed by a prophet who appeared in the region of the lower Jordan valley about the time Jesus reached the age of young manhood. His name was John or Johannan, and from his practice of summoning his hearers to signify their adhesion to the reform movement he led by accepting the rite of immersion in the Jordan, he was known as John the Immerser, or the Baptist. Tradition asserted that he belonged to a priestly family, and even that he was related to Jesus. But this may have been due to the desire of the writers of the

---

[18] The motto of their order as expressed by one of their later leaders, Rabbi Sameas, was, "Love work, eschew dominion, and hold aloof from civil power."

Christian sources to integrate the two movements and represent John's work as a preparation for that of Jesus. The story of John's ministry is very fragmentary, and was written by followers of Jesus. If there were records from his own group, they have perished. Attempts have been made to represent him as an Essene, and the austere manner of his life lends some color to that view. But this is all that can be affirmed.

His preaching drew great companies of people from all sections of Palestine, and his message had all the characteristics of the apocalyptic spirit of the age — denunciation of current evils in church and state, demands for repentance and reform among all classes, and announcement of the early appearance of a messianic figure, one who should bring swift judgment upon that generation, and usher in the day of deliverance. Those who took seriously these threats and promises were called to align themselves with the new enterprise through the symbolic act of baptism. John drew much of his inspiration and imagery from the Hebrew seers, and his message seemed the revival of the long silent voice of prophecy. It is not recorded that he announced himself as the promised messenger of God. Indeed our sources distinctly assert his denial of such an ambition. He said he was merely a "voice," and that the hoped-for leader was still to appear. If the story had been told by John's followers it might have made his claims more emphatic, and the tone of the Gospels, especially the fourth, is in places that of protest against the implied claims of John's followers in behalf of their leader. That the movement started by him persisted in a manner independent of the Christian enterprise seems clear from later reference,[19] and there are even hints that it survived to later centuries.

That the ministry of Jesus began as the result of contact with the work of John seems certain. Attracted by the echoes of the mission at the Jordan, Jesus left his home, doubtless with others, and joined the audience of the preacher from the desert. He came eager and expectant, ready to join the movement for a better order. In the process of his own initiation something happened which presented to him the difficult responsibility of leadership, and sent him away into the silence of the hills to think through the great adventure. It would seem that at that time and throughout his ministry he tested the policies which presented themselves as popular and promising, and rejected them for the austere and sacrificial program which involved apparent failure, but alone promised ultimate success.

Jesus spent something more than three years in a ministry of teaching and preaching which took him on journeys to various places, chiefly in Galilee, with infrequent visits to Jerusalem. He gradually selected from among those who followed him a company of men whom he regarded as his pupils or disciples, and whom he undertook to train as his interpreters to wider regions and later days. He appeared to realize that he could not live long in the midst of the growing opposition of church and state, and that he could not go far.

There were many features of Jewish life which appealed strongly to him and filled him with satisfaction. Among them were the love of nature, delight in the open spaces and the lives of the creatures of the fields and the air, so often the theme of the psalmists and the joy of the people in village and countryside; the beauty of family life, domestic affection, love of children, devotion to their instruction, and the home study of the scriptures; the services of the synagogue, with the readings from the law, the prophets and the other books, and the midrashim or discourses of religious teachers and others who desired to speak; the services at the temple, itself a wonder of art and cost, the shrine of sacred memories and stately rites; and the university, housed in the same holy structure, whose class-rooms were frequented by revered masters of the law and ambitious students.

---

[19] Cf. Acts 19:1–7.

But most of all, there was the proud consciousness of a religion the purest and loftiest known in history, a body of devoted scholars working energetically to multiply and interpret the strangely backward-written scrolls of the holy writings, and a multitude of people, who, however oppressed they might be by an unjust government and heavy taxation, and however shocked they must have been from time to time by the spectacle of outrageous tyranny, brutal cruelty and calculated lust on the part of Romans and Herods, yet maintained a high level of piety, and exhibited on the whole blameless and happy lives. Life under the law was the best example of modest and wholesome living any nation had known. The people were poor, population was crowded, particularly in Galilee, the towns were often unsanitary and the streets filthy, as they frequently are today in Palestine. But these conditions were familiar to Jesus, and he was not offended by them. With a deep love of the people, the men and women and little children, every one of whom seemed to him of inestimable worth, he thought only of sharing with them the new levels of moral and spiritual reality on which he lived, and which he felt to be practicable for all.

He must have been distressed by what he constantly observed of the insolence, contemptuousness and oppression of Roman power. Yet he was no agitator for revolution. He knew that in that direction lay disaster. Therefore he never flamed out against the obvious tyrannies and injustices of the day, such as slavery, the bribery of courts, the war system and other evils of the age. He sowed the seed of the kingdom of God, the new social order of love and good will, and was content to wait for the harvest.

But there were evils that were obvious and remediable and they drew from him sharp and stinging rebuke. The sins he hated and denounced were pride, hypocrisy, self-complacency, formalism, traditionalism, the meticulous observance of rules of external conduct cloaking a selfish and unsympathetic heart. And because he found in his daily contacts with members of the ruling classes in temple and synagogue examples of these disfiguring vices, he denounced them, at times with words that must have blistered as they fell. There is no evidence that all members of the parties in power, the Pharisees, Sadducees, priests and scribes, were guilty of the sins he reproved, or that he so regarded them. But he took note of outstanding examples and used the plainest speech, the most mordant terms. These utterances of his have set in the tall pillory of just condemnation those offenses through all the centuries since his day, whether in priest or preacher, leader or layman. On people who were social outcasts, like the publican and the harlot, Jesus wasted no words of condemnation. Society had already dealt with them. Rather he tried to encourage them to go and sin no more. But for those in real danger, the wealthy, the complacent, the cold-hearted and unloving, he had words of warning and rebuke, because he trembled for their destiny in this and every other world.

The men whom he thus denounced naturally resented his criticism of their lives. Probably just as severe castigation was visited upon Jesus by those of their own order. The business of the rabbi, the preacher, the priest, is to reprove, rebuke, exhort. But Jesus was something of an outsider. He had not been trained as a rabbi and in his teachings he showed indifference to matters which they regarded as of prime value. He was a conforming Jew. He observed the law as an obedient son of the Torah. But because he insisted that the Sabbath was a servant and not a master, that unprescribed food was not the most serious of the things which defile, that the Hebrew scriptures did not contain the last word of revelation and that Moses was not the final authority, they were deeply shocked and offended. Probably rightly so. No doubt Jesus counted on their indignation as an aid not only in their religious education, but in that of all men. It is of little value to utter commonplace and obvious truths. People concede them and forget them. But when men are angered by an unwelcome fact they may go away furious, but they think it over.

It must have saddened Jesus to realize that he could not come to terms with the best men of his day except by compromise. That subtle appeal to accept the policies of the religious leaders of the age and take the more popular road to success he had met in recurring assaults from the days of the first temptation. But that way lay failure for him. Unfortunately it was impossible to separate the men he criticized from the groups with which they were connected. Jesus' protests against the formalism, ceremonialism, avarice and pride of men in the ecclesiastical ranks easily passed for censure on the entire Jewish system. Opposition developed. Jesus was increasingly a disturber of the peace. A breach with the Jewish authorities was unavoidable. Certain it is that it occurred.

We have the story only from Christian sources. It is possible that if a representative of Judaism had written an account of Jesus' ministry, a different light might have been thrown upon the origins of the Christian movement. In our narratives a heavy burden is laid upon the Jews. The terms in which their leaders are pictured are often, perhaps usually, terms of reproach. The word "Pharisees" is almost always employed in a hostile sense.[20] In the fourth Gospel the word "Jew" means in almost every instance an enemy of the cause. One is tempted to wonder whether this represents the appreciative and tolerant spirit of Jesus or the growing sentiment of resentment growing out of later evangelistic efforts. The story of the crucifixion assigns the blame to the Jews and passes lightly over the total failure of Roman justice in the event. This has been the common Christian view, and the basis of tragic persecution of Jews through the centuries.[21]

---

[20] Cf. Riddle, *Jesus and the Pharisees;* Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels;* Herford, *The Pharisees.*

[21] Recall the excited exclamation of Clovis at a sermon on the Crucifixion, "Had I been there with my Franks!"

In comparing the two movements, Judaism and Christianity, at the moment of their most intimate contact, it is apparent that those features in Judaism against which Jesus and his first interpreters reacted with growing disapproval were the external and ceremonial rites which seemed to them of little worth. It must not be forgotten that thoughtful Jews may well have taken the same attitude. But, as in the later history of both Judaism and Christianity, there often appears a certain deep loyalty to a rite not because of any intrinsic value it may possess, but because of its traditional association with the divine will. When Jesus commented with disapproval on the meticulous tithing of herbs in the gardens, or the careful avoidance of food that was tabu, the answer of a conforming Jew might well have been, Who shall decide what is essential and what is superficial in matters believed to be of divine direction? It was at this point that the two groups increasingly parted company. Jesus, holding to the principles of the Torah, felt at liberty to disregard practices that to the conservative Jewish leaders appeared vital. The same cleavage has often emerged in the church in reference to biblical criticism, holy orders, the mode of baptism, and similar items in the Christian program. Paul faced such questions within the circle of early believers. When one assumes that Jesus was right and the Jewish leaders were wrong in their contrasted views of obedience to the Torah he misses the point of the difference. It was the contrast between rules believed to be of divine origin and authority, and principles that looked beyond rules to their deeper values.

The attitude of Jesus, like that of many of the reformers in the history of religion, was first one of protest against current usages which he felt to be trivial and non-essential, however emphatic the rabbinical tradition might be. And this protest was based on an appeal to the Hebrew prophets who back of the priestly institutes of the later years represented the basic ethical and spiritual ideals that gave classic Israel its authentic message. To that extent Christianity was a reformation within the area of Judaism, and was probably so regarded by most of those who watched its early progress. Its relations to current beliefs and practices were much like those of Buddhism to the prevailing Hinduism of the fifth and fourth pre-Christian centuries, or of the Protestant movement to the Roman Church. Each was a protest against what were conceived to be the formal and superficial elements in present belief and practice and an appeal to a past in which more basic and ideal values were discovered. To this extent every reformation is an attempt to restore an earlier and presumably more fundamental order. Jesus regarded himself as the successor and interpreter of the Hebrew prophets, save that he was dowered with an authority which neither Moses nor any other leader of the past possessed. He had no ambition to be the founder of a new religion. That estate fell to him in virtue of his preëminent personality and the fresh and vital program he announced.

In complete contrast with the spirit of official Judaism Jesus laid down no rules of conduct. One searches his teachings in vain to find a body of precepts to which conformity is demanded. Even his instructions regarding baptism and the holy supper were less commands than suggestions regarding symbolic and useful observances. The one constantly repeated injunction was to the practice of love as the dominant requirement in the new movement, and in furtherance of this ideal the urgent direction to carry the good news to all men. He announced the central and dominant motive of his ministry — love — and he trusted his followers to work out that ideal in all their conduct. He was himself the living example of this principle. Love to God and love to all classes of men was the rule and passion of his life. It was the heart of his religion, and he was firm in the faith that it would solve every problem of human conduct and relations.

In the midst of the calm and poise of his daily ministry there was a certain eager anxiety to inaugurate this pattern of life among his friends, and through them to expand it to the wider world. He exhibited always an urgent solicitude for the welfare of those about him. This was the controlling motive which revealed itself in his sympathy for all classes, his works of healing, his interest and skill in personal adjustments, his application of spiritual power to the disorders of human life, and his indignation at the evils that marred character and disturbed the society of his day. He might, like other reformers, have chosen the method of force, and inaugurated rebellion against the tyrannies of Rome. His disciples expected him to take this course. Their anxious question, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"[22] discloses their belief that when he talked of the kingdom of heaven he had in prospect a revolutionary effort to regain independence for his people. His repeated attempts to correct this error in their minds failed of this purpose,[23] and even the debacle of their hopes on the day of the tumultuous entry into Jerusalem did not quench their optimism.

---

[22] Acts 1:6, 7.

Far different was the "faith of Jesus"[24] from this political ambition of the disciples. The elements embodied in that faith, which was first of all the personal religion of Jesus, were the unfailing love of the Father and complete trust in him; devotion to the scriptures as the product of the divine spirit in the life of ancient Israel; and a growing conviction that the historic, redemptive task of the Hebrew people had failed of achievement through their disobedience and disappearance from history, and showed no signs of accomplishment through current Judaism. Accordingly it was his increasing conviction that upon him, the embodiment of the prophetic spirit of the past, lay the responsibility for the attainment of the divine program for humanity, that his secret of a devoted, sacrificial life of love to the Father and to all mankind as his brethren was "the way" of salvation, and that those who responded to his message, of whatever race or caste, were to be the elect brotherhood, the holy company, the blameless family of God. This was no exclusive or partisan enterprise. Jesus asserted that there were "other sheep" than those in the Jewish fold, and that his program embraced all. If he could have met the great souls whose names and teachings were revered by distant nations in the orient, he would have found in them kindred spirits in the adventure of spiritual enlightenment. But he bated no jot of his insistence on the holiness, justice and love of God, the need of all humanity for the personal and social salvation he revealed, and his faith in the worth and salvability of every human life.

---

[23] Matt. 16:20; 20:20–23; etc.

[24] Rev. 14:12.

It is not strange that a character like this divides history into two parts. There was in Jesus Christ an authority, a completeness of personality and a finality which sets all other members of the race in a different group. This is not a point to be labored. It is rather the statement of a luminous fact. If it is not evident and convincing, it is useless to make it a point of controversy. Each one will evaluate the life of the Christ according to his own standard, and apparently he was not greatly concerned as to what men thought of him. His supreme anxiety related to their attitude toward the Father and the good way. Into the mystery of Jesus' own nature no one has ever satisfactorily penetrated. The record is too brief and too fragmentary to satisfy the student. We only know that those who came within the circle of his life searched the vocabulary for words to express their wonder and their love. It was their experience, and it has been the experience of countless others in later centuries, that something happens in the lives of those who come to terms with Jesus Christ which makes it easier to resist temptation, to maintain faith in a moral order, to live a sacrificial, serviceable and triumphant life, and to abide in the confidence that love and not death has the final word. A transformation of this character is worthy to be called "salvation," "redemption," "atonement," or by any other of the rich and indefinable terms by which Jesus' first friends attempted to describe the mystery of his life and death.

The "faith of Jesus" inevitably passed from the subjective area of his own personal religion to the wider one of an objective example and authority. It became the faith of the new society in him, as lord and savior, the revelation of God in terms of human life, the center of a world's desire. His death as the result of ecclesiastical jealousy, mob excitement and Roman incapacity fearful of a possible aspirant to revolutionary leadership, dampened for a moment the confidence of his friends, but only for a moment. The conviction that he had conquered death and was alive forevermore became, with the fact of his sacrificial death, the basis of a growing assurance of the success of his ministry. His followers multiplied in Jerusalem and throughout Palestine. Limited at first to Jewish circles, the message gradually spread to non-Jewish groups, chiefly through the preaching of the martyr Stephen and the notable ministries of Paul of Tarsus. In Antioch the name " Christian " was first heard. Missionaries carried the " good news," as they called it, to wider regions. Later tradition affirmed that the apostles made distant lands their parishes. By the end of the first century of the present era the Christian message had traveled to nearly all parts of the Graeco-Roman world, and after conflicts with the paganism of the empire it became through the conversion of Constantine the official religion. This was a doubtful success, as the establishment of a political cultus is always likely to be. But at least Christianity was no longer an illicit faith, and the days of Roman persecution ceased.

Meantime Judaism was not greatly affected by the beginnings and early phases of Christianity. The new movement even met a measure of favor in Jerusalem. It was viewed as one more of the many reform enterprises, political, social, religious, which had taken form in Palestine in recent years. Most of them had been of brief duration, because they bore the stamp of sedition, and were soon crushed by the government. The movement inaugurated by John the Baptist might easily bear this interpretation in Jewish minds. In fact this was the view of Josephus regarding it.[25] On the other hand the Nazarenes, as the friends of Jesus were called, could hardly be accused of cherishing any political ambitions. Jesus had distinctly disclaimed such projects.[26] It was only by astonishing misuse of his utterances that any political ambitions could be charged against him.[27] His disciples were conforming Jews, who held to all the sanctions of the Torah, and were obedient to the prescribed rules.[28] They shared the beliefs and practices which gave to Judaism its commanding place as an ethical, humane, intelligent system in contrast with much of the surrounding pagan life. In education, home life, morals and devotion to the ideals of monotheism the Jews were by far the most exemplary people of the age. This fact accounted for the large number of proselytes who turned from the scepticism, immorality and levity of much of the prevailing heathenism to the more austere and purposeful commitments of Judaism.

The fact that the followers of Jesus held these convictions regarding God, the scriptures, the temple and the daily rules of conduct, in common with the other Jews around them, was sufficient reason for the measure of good will shown them in the first days of the movement. That they added to the essential elements of Judaism their belief in the messianic function of one who had been put to death as an offender against law and order might well subject them to suspicion and even ridicule, but did not ostracise them. If their leaders were arrested on occasion, it was less because of any serious wrong charged against them than because of the excitement their preaching caused and the crowds that blocked the streets.[29] Like the Salvation Army in its first years, they were subject to police repression, not because their message was obnoxious, but because they caused disturbances in traffic. At the same time their preaching of the good news of the kingdom of God, which had much of the fervor of messianic expectation, won large numbers of converts to their cause, and one reads with some surprise that many even of the priests were added to the number.[30] Thus far at least there was tolerance and a measure of good will on the part of the Jewish community toward the Nazarenes. There is no reason to suppose that public opinion regarding Jesus differed from that felt toward any of the men who had attempted to arouse the people to protest against the evils of the time, political, social or religious. Probably his person and ministry were not widely known, and under the pressure of the exciting events of the time even the tragedy of Calvary soon faded from the public mind.

---

[25] *Ant.* XVIII. 5. 2.

[26] John 6:15; 18:36, etc.

[27] Matt. 26:61–66; John 2:19–22; 18:33–38.

[28] Acts 3:1; etc.

That which brought the enterprise to the surprised and alarmed attention of the Jewish authorities was the bold challenge of the evangelist Stephen, to the effect that Moses was no longer to be regarded as the source of authority, but rather the Nazarene, whom, as he asserted, they had done to death in spite of his prophetic character and blameless life. In effect this new interpretation of the place and function of Jesus in the divine program quite displaced Moses and the temple from their central and commanding place in the Jewish system, and substituted Jesus in their stead.[31] This attack upon Jewish traditions opened a breach between the two groups, which was widened by the martyr death of Stephen, the subsequent persecution of the Nazarenes and the conversion of Saul of Tarsus to the new faith. This man, who later became the apostle Paul, came from the inner circle of Pharisaism to become the champion of aggressive Christianity, and the mediator of the gospel to the Graeco-Roman world. The universal and radical implications of the teachings of Jesus were comprehended only partially by the Jerusalem circle of his followers. If left to them the new movement might have remained an inoffensive reform within the zone of Judaism. In the preaching of Stephen and later of Paul it broke from this limitation and became a cosmic adventure.

---

[29] Acts 4:1–4; 5:17, 18.

[30] Acts 6:7.

The breach thus created between Judaism and Christianity was not healed. The non-Christian Jews resented the claims made in behalf of Jesus, and there was division of sentiment in the new society itself. Many of the members held the opinion that the observance of Jewish rites, like circumcision, sacrifice, fasting and pilgrimage, was an essential part of their Christian obligation. The liberals under Paul's leadership held that the legal requirements of Judaism were no longer obligatory. The conservatives in the Jerusalem group were later outvoted or ignored,[32] though they continued to be an obstructive force for many years. This separation seemed to Paul an unhappy mistake. It was his conviction that Jesus was the most conspicuous and impressive gift Judaism had made to the world and it was nothing less than tragic that there should be any cleavage between his friends and the great body of his people. This came to be the accepted Christian view. From the standpoint of the early church there was a fatal miscarriage of loyalties in the failure of Judaism and the friends of Jesus to find common ground. He belonged to them and might well have claimed world-wide interpretation at their hands. As one of the later writers of the New Testament expressed it, "He came to his own, and they that were his own received him not."[33]

---

[31] Acts, chapts. 6, 7.

[32] See Acts, chapt. 15; Galatians *passim*.

In the light of centuries of the unhappy results of that separation it is not difficult to discern something of its causes. From the Jewish angle it was too harsh a reading of the past history of Judaism to have its most precious possessions, the Torah and the temple, set on a lower level, while the place of power was accorded to one of recent origin and laic order, however convincing and authoritative his message might be. To men of Paul's type it was a most unhappy mistake that a gospel essentially Jewish in its origins, and offering the same truths of ethical monotheism that the prophets of Israel had proclaimed and that Judaism had interpreted since the times of Ezra, should miss the divine chance to carry that truth to the whole world.

The Jews of the diaspora were in every land. Their synagogues were the first resort of Christian evangelists. The followers of Jesus in the first generation held the ineradicable conviction that to the Jews belonged the first privileges of the gospel. Only as they declined participation in the cause were non-Jews approached.[34] After the fall of Jerusalem in the Roman war, and the close of Jewish history, it seemed to these men that with a growing world society of this basic character there was no longer need of a nation with a merely ethnic message. The age was ready for a universal faith. Rome had one realm and one ruler, though many religions. There ought to be a place for one religion prevalent through many realms. That which Judaism possessed was a body of truths the loftiest and purest the world had known, and for a brief period it showed the will to carry this religion in a missionary spirit to the world. What it lacked was a central and commanding figure, the embodiment of its message and the leader of its divine crusade. On any, even the most modest evaluation of the character of Jesus, he offered this leadership and this authority. A few of his racial group took him seriously, and the widening circles of his followers proved that his message was adapted to all mankind and every age. It is this difference in outlook which presents the contrast between the racial interests of Judaism and the cosmic concern of Christianity; the marked divergence between the intensive and introspective literature of Judaism through these formative years and the world-embracing outlook of the Christian sources. It is no discredit to Judaism to affirm that it chose deliberately, after its momentary experiment in the area of proselytism, to limit its ministries to its own people. Other ethnic groups have done the same, and with wholesome results.[35] It is the more significant that in our own day liberal Jewish leaders have felt the obligation to offer the message of Judaism to the wider world. In the measure in which it accepts its responsibility to bear its testimony to mankind in behalf of peace and righteousness it may in some degree fulfill the hopes of its early confessors, and justify its age-long survival and martyrdom.

---

[33] John 1:11.

---

[34] Acts 11:19; 13:46; 18:5, 6, etc.

[35] The Parsees in India, the followers of Shinto in Japan, etc.

IX

THE END OF THE JEWISH STATE

The year 63 B.C. in which the Roman general Pompey conquered Jerusalem ushered in the period of Roman domination in Palestine, which led at last to the Jewish-Roman war, the destruction of Jerusalem and the downfall of the Jewish state.

From the times of Alexander the Great the near east was a liability which the west tried to liquidate. Rome regarded itself as the legatee and custodian of Alexander's eastern empire, which theoretically extended from the Euphrates to the Indus. Already in the days of Judas Maccabaeus and his brother Jonathan appeal was made to the Roman senate by these Jewish patriots for assistance against the encroachments of Syria, and the covenants then made bound upon the Jewish state the heavy burden of Roman alliance, which meant virtually Roman control. From this time onward the internal affairs of Palestine were regarded by Roman leaders as matters for their direction. When Julius Caesar made his expedition into Egypt in days when rival Maccabean princes were contending for the Judean throne, Antipater, an Idumean, or Edomite, secured his favor, was made procurator of Judea, and given the rights of Roman citizenship.[1] After his death his sons Phasaelus and Herod were appointed by Antony as tetrarchs of that province, and after the Parthian war waged in the attempt to make Antigonus, the last of the Maccabees, king,[2] Herod went to Rome, won the favor of Antony and Octavius Caesar (Augustus) and was appointed king of Judea. With two Roman legions he conquered Jerusalem in 37 B.C. and began his long career of politics and building by the construction of the tower of Antonia on the site of the fortress Baris built by Hyrcanus north-west of the temple, and known as the citadel.

---

[1] By his wife Cypros, an Arab woman, Antipater had four sons, Phasaelus, Herod, Joseph and Pharoras, and a daughter, Salome.

The period thus begun was preëminently one of Roman influence in Palestine. Cities were erected, or rebuilt, in the Roman pattern, and given Roman or Herodian names.[3] Heavy tribute was exacted from an unwilling people to finance Herod's grandiose projects.[4] For these numerous and ambitious designs an enormous revenue was needed. Herod's gifts of money to his Roman friends added greatly to the burdens borne by his subjects. Some of these gifts were a gesture of friendliness to the Jewish communities in the cities thus enriched, but the Jews of Palestine had little interest in the pretentious benefactions of one of alien race and despotic nature. Even the gorgeous temple was small compensation for the cost of the Herodian administration with its Roman connections.

---

[2] Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, sons of Alexander Jannaeus, were rival claimants to the Jewish throne. Each appealed to Pompey for his support. The Roman confirmed Hyrcanus in the high priesthood, but stripped him of political power, annexed Palestine to the empire, and took Aristobulus to Rome. The latter escaped, secured Parthian aid and made a futile effort to obtain the kingship. This ended the Maccabean dynasty.

[3] Herod named Antonia for his friend and patron, Antony; Antipatris for his father Antipater; Cypros, a citadel at Jericho, he built and named in honor of his mother; the three Jerusalem towers in the upper city, Mariamne, Phasaelus and Hippicus he named for his wife, his brother and his friend; Samaria he rebuilt and renamed Sabaste in honor of Augustus (Sabastus); Caesarea, formerly called Strato's Tower, he renamed in honor of Augustus; one of Herod's sons, Antipas, built Tiberias and named it in honor of the reigning Caesar, and another son, Philip, rebuilt Panias and called it Caesarea-Philippi a tribute to the emperor and himself. He also erected Julias in Gaulanitis. Machaerus (the name of a Roman general), and many other fortresses and towns were given names in honor of the Herods or their Roman patrons.

[4] In addition to his extravagant enterprises in his own territory he erected costly public buildings in Tripoli, Antioch, Damascus, Byblos, Berytus, Tyre, Sidon and Askalon. His ostentatious benefactions reached other regions like Rhodes, Lycia, the Ionian cities, Athens, Nicopolis and Pergamum.

On the death of Herod, an event hailed with a sense of relief by every Jew, Archelaus his eldest son succeeded him as ethnarch. The other sons, Antipas and Philip, were given small territories as tetrarchs. Complaint was made to Augustus by deputations of Jews and Samaritans protesting against the cruelty and exactions of Archelaus, and in the ninth year of his rule he was banished to Gaul. With these events the last vestige of freedom passed from the unhappy province. Roman procurators were placed over it.[5] The emperor Claudius permitted Agrippa, a grandson of Herod, to exercise a shadowy authority with the title of king, and a second Agrippa, his son, followed him, with a similar complimentary tolerance from Rome. But the government was really administered by Roman procurators, and all independence vanished. Even the high priests, under the later Herods and the procurators, were named by the rulers, and the breach widened between the Jews and their overlords.

---

[5] The list of procurators is as follows: Pontius Pilate, appointed by Tiberius, 25–36; Cuspius Fadus, sent by Claudius, 44–45; Tiberius Alexander, a Jew, nephew of Philo, 45–48; Cumanus, 48–52; Felix, 52–60; Porcius Festus, 60–62; Albanus, 62–64; Gessius Florus, 64–66. Several of these Roman and Herodian figures appear in the Gospels and the Acts: Augustus, Matt. 22:17–21; Luke 2:2; John 19:12–15; Tiberius, Luke 3:1; Claudius, Acts 11:28; 18:2; Nero, Acts 25:12; 26:32; 28:19; 1 Tim. 4:16, 17; Herod the Great, Matt. 2:1–19; Luke 1:5; Acts 4:27; Archelaus, Matt. 3:22; Herod Antipas, Luke 3:1; 23:5–12; Acts 12:1–6; 19–23; Herod Philip, Luke 3:1; Herod Agrippa I, Acts 12:1–6; 19:23; Herod Agrippa II, Acts 25:13–26:32; Pontius Pilate, Matt. 27:1–26; Luke 23:1–25; John 18:29–19:38; Acts 4:27; 1 Tim. 6:13; Felix, Acts 23:24; 24:1–27; Porcius Festus, Acts 24:27–26:32.

The taxes were farmed out by the government to provincial contractors at the highest bid, and collectors called publicans were employed to bring in the revenue, less in accordance with a fixed and equitable levy than on the principle of exacting all the traffic would bear. It was not strange that these publicans were regarded with hatred by their fellow Jews. Meantime the people had no political rights. There was neither constitution nor franchise. The administration of law was more equitable and less capricious under direct Roman rule than under the Herods, but it was a harsh and contemptuous rule at best.[6] The influence of Rome upon the Jews was profound. The struggle, ethical and political, stiffened the fibres of Jewish loyalty. It created the hard shell of Jewish exclusiveness, which alone saved the race in the tragic days which followed. Rome destroyed the Jewish state, but it molded the Jewish race.

Several unfortunate incidents roused the resentment of the Jews against their political masters. In his construction of the temple Herod set an eagle, the symbol of Roman power, above the gate. Some of the rabbis, furious at this pagan desecration of the sanctuary, let themselves down from the top of the porch and destroyed the effigy. For this they were burned alive by Herod's orders, thus becoming martyrs in the regard of the nation. Pilate incurred the hostility of the people by taking Roman ensigns into the temple courts. These images had the significance of idols to the Jews, and a crowd of them lay prostrate before his quarters for five days in protest against the sacrilege, until the offending images were removed. When Pilate appropriated the treasure (corban) of the temple to the construction of an aqueduct, a similar indignant opposition was aroused, and a number of the people were beaten to death. When Caius (Caligula) was proclaimed emperor, he ordered Petronius, the governor of Syria, to place his statue in the temple. The Jews made earnest supplication to the Roman to desist from this outrage. The emperor was furious and ordered the governor to enforce his will with the legionaries. Fortunately before the matter came to a bloody issue news arrived of the murder of Caius.[7]

---

[6] The haughty and disdainful attitude of the Romans toward the Jews is reflected by the Latin historian Tacitus who in his account of this period refers to them in such disrespectful terms as, " the scum and refuse of other nations," " the vilest," " this execrable nation," " their manners repugnant to the rest of mankind," " enslaved to superstition " (*Hist.* V. 1–13 *passim*). The same attitude toward the Jews is exhibited by Horace and Juvenal. The reasons for this contemptuous sentiment of the Romans toward the Jews lay in their stubborn and unwavering loyalty to their religion, their law and their traditions in contrast with the easy acceptance of Roman ideas by most of the subject nations.

While these disturbing events were agitating the Jewish groups in the capital and the surrounding regions, other forces were at work to make inevitable an early and definite break with Rome. The appearance of writings of the apocalyptic order, laying stress upon an early catastrophic deliverance of the Jewish state from its enemies, was increasingly frequent. The books of Daniel and Enoch had set the pattern for this type of literature in the days of the Syrian persecution. Now that Rome had become the source of trouble, the same order of writing sprang into vogue again. Books like the Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Apocalypses of Esdras, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Testimonies of the Twelve Patriarchs and fresh interpolations in the Sibylline Oracles pointed to deliverance from the evils of the present in a miraculous and ideal future soon to be realized through the divine interposition.

---

[7] The list of Roman emperors during the period of the Jewish struggle is as follows: Julius Caesar, never actually emperor, but the first of the Julian line, whose name became the dynastic title of his successors, as well as of several later European ruling houses (cf. Kaisar, Czar, etc.); Octavius (Augustus), 31–14 B.C.; Tiberius, 14 B.C.–37 A.D.; Caius (Caligula), 37–41 A.D.; Claudius, 41–54; Nero, 54–69; Galba 69; Otho, 69; Vitellius, 69; Vespasian, 69–79; Titus, 79–81; Domitian, 81–96; Nerva, 96–98; Trajan, 98–117; Hadrian, 117–138.

Some of these works attempted to call the nation back to its more spiritual ideals, and insisted that not in arms but in the intervention of God in behalf of his people was deliverance to be found. The messianic hope of a free nation under a heavenly ruler was soon to be brought to fruition. Writers of the Pharisean conviction were unwilling to accept the Roman solution of their national problem. Dreams of a Davidic kingdom to be reëstablished in Palestine filled the air. The Maccabean rulers, so they felt, had betrayed the people into the hands of a foreign master. Independence must be achieved at all hazards. If, as some thought, this was to come through supernatural intervention in the affairs of Judea, let it come soon. If it must come as the result of a war for freedom, as in Hasmonian days, then it were well to win by the sword. These were the writings and the arguments which were passing from hand to hand and mind to mind in these years of the first century of our era.

A new and energetic party had taken form, the Zealots, who regarded the payment of taxes to Rome as disloyal to the ideals of Judaism. They openly advocated war against their overlords. Led on by such men as Zadduk the Pharisee and

Judas the Galilean, they joined the sanctions of religion to the practical aims of the earlier Maccabeans in a combination of apocalyptic hope and patriotic passion. The war spirit was rapidly growing in the land. The more conservative Pharisees were not so fiery. They would have counseled moderation and patience. But the radical leaders of the hour, unmindful of the lessons which ought to have emerged from the story of other peoples who resisted Roman domination, hurried the nation into a war whose outcome the wise might have foreseen. It was this combination of Jewish loyalty, optimism, courage and fanaticism which led to the inevitable catastrophe. Who of the pious could doubt that at the moment of crisis the arm of God would be bared to deliver his people?

It was these qualities which rendered the Jews so difficult to rule. During all the years of Roman control Palestine was classified as an imperial province, which implied that it was under the immediate authority of the emperor, administered by procurators, while the more tractable areas were known as senatorial provinces, and were under the jurisdiction of proconsuls. The need for this more direct and severe administration lay in the frequent outbreaks of revolutionary leaders against the government. The combination of messianic hopes and popular exasperation issued in repeated uprisings on the part either of messianic pretenders or of political revolutionaries.

One of them named Simon in Perea led a force which burned the palace in Jericho and committed other depredations until suppressed. A certain Theudas, a prophetic adventurer, led astray many by promising to conduct them through the Jordan dry-shod. He was disposed of by Cuspius Fadus.[8] Judas of Galilee was another of these unsuccessful seekers after leadership.[9] There was a so-called prophet from Egypt who led some thousands of deluded men through the desert to the Mount of Olives for the purpose of attacking Jerusalem, and whose followers were soon dispersed.[10] In fact there were constant revolts against the Roman power in Palestine from the days of Pompey to those of the Herods. There were riots, outrages by bandits and assassins,[11] and other disturbances during most of these years. Bloody contests took place between Galileans and Samaritans in the days of Cumanus, as in earlier times, but in general the Samaritans sided with the Jews in their struggle against Rome.

Nor were the Jews in other lands exempt from the race hatred which Roman officials manifested toward them. In Egypt they were very numerous. Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar had been friendly to them. An entire quarter in Alexandria was occupied by Jews, and they possessed a temple at Leontopolis. They had enriched the literature of Egypt and the world by translating the Hebrew scriptures into Greek in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus. But on the accession of Caius (Caligula) his demand that his image be set up in the synagogues led to riots in which the Jewish section of the city was sacked. An embassy was sent to Rome to explain the event and to plead for justice. This deputation was headed by Philo,[12] the most noted of the

---

[8] Acts 5:36; Josephus, *Ant.* V. 11. 6; Case, *Jesus,* p. 264.

[9] Acts 5:37.

[10] Acts 21:38.

[11] The Sicarii, or "Knifers," of whom Josephus writes.

[12] 40 A.D.

Jewish leaders, who shared with Ezra the honor of founding Judaism. On this occasion the large Jewish colony in Rome seconded the efforts of their compatriots from Judea.

Roman sentiment regarding Jews varied with localities and circumstances. Because of their strict monotheism they would be likely to incur the suspicion and disapproval of the pagan empire, with its heathen priesthood and its pantheon of gods. Yet many Jews enjoyed the favor of the ruling classes and even of the imperial circle. Poppaea, the wife of Nero, was a Jewess. Drusilla, the wife of Felix, was of the same race.[13] Jews were often commercially successful, and therefore of great value on occasion. In contrast with the Christians, who were generally treated with severity because of their refusal to participate in the cult of emperor-worship, the Jews, who were equally strict in their beliefs, were tolerated in their religious practices. They were of much greater importance as citizens because of their wealth and their commercial contacts.

Yet too frequently they were the objects of persecution and mob violence. Acts of cruel injustice were committed against them. The emperor Claudius in one of his vindictive moments decreed the banishment of all Jews from Rome,[14] and although such a tyrannical measure was difficult of enforcement, and was soon disregarded, it occasioned great suffering and loss for the time. The Jews were not popular. As in later centuries their religious beliefs and social customs, their disdain of their gentile neighbors and their withdrawal from the usual contacts of the pagan world, made them the objects of suspicion and hatred.

---

[13] Acts 24:24.

[14] Acts 18:2.

Those who lived in Palestine were found difficult to govern by the Roman procurators. Not one of all the seven who held that position found his office easy to administer. Indeed it was the belief of Josephus, the historian of the Jewish-Roman war[15] that Gessius Florus, during whose official career the war began, deliberately fomented rebellion by his barbarous and insulting behavior toward his Jewish subjects.

The first open act of hostility was the attack made by Jewish revolutionaries on the Roman fortress of Masada near the Dead Sea, whose garrison was surprised and massacred. Cestius Gallus, the proconsul of Syria, was ordered south from Antioch to occupy the region now showing unmistakable tokens of complete revolt. A Jewish army was rapidly raised, and commanders were chosen, one of whom was Josephus. The only city to receive the Roman troops advancing to reinforce the legions at Caesarea and in the scattered fortresses of the land was Sepphoris, the strongest city of Galilee, which gladly welcomed the imperial columns. Meantime the emperor Nero, who had always regarded his eastern provinces with a superstitious solicitude, despatched Vespasian, the ablest of his generals, to assume command in the threatened area. The first measures taken to subdue the rebellion were moderate and conciliatory. Vespasian did not attack Jerusalem, but took outlying cities like Jotopata and Gadara, hoping to bring the nation to obedience. Cestius Gallus advanced on Jerusalem in a threatening gesture, and camped on Mt. Scopus east of the city. He could have taken the place without difficulty, but instead removed his forces to Beth-horon and Antipatris. In the light of later events this lenient attitude toward the Jewish capital was regarded as a mistake. Its prompt subjection at this stage of the agitation might have saved many months of struggle and a multitude of lives.

---

[15] Flavius Josephus (37–95 A.D.) a Jewish scholar and soldier who lived in Palestine in the years preceding the war with Rome. He made a journey to Rome in 64 A.D. in behalf of his people, and was assisted in his mission by the empress Poppaea. He was greatly impressed by the power of the empire. He was chosen as one of the Jewish generals, and took an active part in the earlier stages of the conflict. Later he was made prisoner by the Romans, but was released by Titus in order to employ his services with the Jews during the siege of Jerusalem. In later years he resided at Rome. He was favorable to Roman culture, and yet loyal to Jewish interests. His written works include the *Antiquities of the Jews,* a work that follows in general the narrative of the Old Testament, though with the addition of many, often fanciful, traditions. This work was completed about 93 A.D. The *Wars of the Jews* is the record of the Jewish-Roman conflict, in which Josephus himself had a part. It is the chief source for the knowledge of this period, though frequently marked by the author's tendency to exaggeration. In both of these works Josephus glorified the Jews while preserving his admiration for Roman arms and authority. A third book, *Against Apion,* is an apologetic work in defense of Jewish laws and customs. He wrote in addition an autobiography. Like Philo and other Jewish writers of the early Christian centuries he held to the view that all the wisdom of the ancients, particularly the Greeks, was derived from Moses and the Old Testament.

As disorders were still frequent in Egypt between the Jews and their enemies, Vespasian ordered the temple of Onias at Leontopolis plundered and closed. Thus after the continuance of Jewish worship there for nearly 350 years this sanctuary in a foreign land came to its end.[16]

The Jews in Jerusalem were in no manner prepared to resist the Roman advance, save as they relied on the strength of the city walls. But all serious efforts at defense were rendered futile by strife between the Jewish factions within the city. One of them rallied under Simon of Gerasa in the upper city, and one under John of Gischila in the temple area, which was like a fortress for strength. Later in the siege the inner court of the temple itself became the last stronghold of the besieged, held first by the party of a certain Eleazar, and later by that of John.[17] The situation was rendered more tragic by the fact that multitudes of Jews from all sections of the Jewish world had journeyed to Jerusalem to attend the annual feast of the Passover. Tacitus estimated the number of such pilgrims, including proselytes, at 600,000. Josephus says that 256,500 Passover lambs were slain in celebrating this feast, which gives some idea of the great number of citizens and visitors in the city.[18]

---

[16] Josephus, *Wars,* VII. 10. 4; cf. the reference in Jer. 6:5.

When it became evident that nothing but the destruction of Jerusalem could end the rebellion, Vespasian, whom the suicide of Nero had recalled to Rome to look after his own imperial interests, summoned his son Titus from Egypt to complete the task. The latter started instantly, and reached Jerusalem with all dispatch.[19]

It will be remembered that in his apocalyptic discourse to the disciples shortly before the end of his ministry Jesus warned them of the approaching tragedy of Jerusalem, and counseled them to escape from the city while there was time.[20] Early Christian tradition affirmed that numbers heeded this warning and took refuge in Pella, east of the Jordan, thereby escaping the catastrophe. But as the Christian community was as yet almost entirely Jewish, the tragic fate of Jerusalem was regarded by the followers of Jesus as an event as terrible in its import as the sufferings their own brethren endured in the Neronian and later persecutions at Rome.

---

[17] Tacitus, *History,* V. 12.

[18] Perhaps an average of ten people for each lamb would be a fair estimate.

[19] The route of Titus included Nicopolis, thence by ship to Themnis, then Tanis, Heracleopolis, Pelusium, the Temple of Casian Jupiter, Astracine, Rhinocolura, Raphia, Gaza, Askalon, Jamnia, Joppa, Caesarea; thence through Samaria and Gophna, to Gibeah of Saul, 30 furlongs from Jerusalem. He established his legions on Mt. Scopus and the Mount of Olives.

[20] Matt. 24:1–28; cf. Rev. 12:14, as a probable reference to the same series of events.

Early assaults made by Titus upon Jerusalem were repulsed with desperate valor. The hostile parties in the city alternately fought each other and joined forces against the enemy without. Jewish colonies on the Euphrates were importuned by messengers from Jerusalem to aid the revolt against Rome. The walls were strengthened, so that in some sections they were of triple strength. The Romans on their side set up their huge engines for the hurling of stones, and kept up a constant battering of the walls. To provide these engines and their barricades they stripped the country of trees for many miles around. As the siege went on the supply of food began to fail, and all the superfluous citizens and strangers were expelled. The Romans stopped this effort at relief by putting to death, usually by crucifixion, such refugees, and bands of robbers added to the horror of the time by robbing and murdering those who escaped the Romans. Bodies of Idumeans, who had joined the Jews in their struggle against their common masters, were allowed to depart. But to render the escape of Jews impossible Titus constructed a wall around the entire city. Josephus states that Titus employed him as a messenger to plead with his people to surrender, and thus put an end to the siege, but to no purpose. The fate of the Jews was rendered more torturing by the fact that though their supplies of corn were at the vanishing point, the Romans ostentatiously displayed their unlimited stores. The contending Jewish factions now realized the folly of their partisan struggles, as several large store-houses filled with grain had been burned in the inter-factional riots earlier in the investment of the city.

Gradually the Roman lines were pushed nearer, and the successive walls were penetrated. The younger Agrippa, who with his sister Berenice was in the city, pleaded with the citizens not to resist further the unconquerable Romans, who had taken Carthage and the strongest cities in the world; to be vanquished by whom was no disgrace. It was all in vain. The madness of slaughter had infected the blood of the besieged. False prophets predicted victory for their cause. Portents presaging their deliverance were daily reported. Fires broke out in the upper city and at the tower of Antonia. Furious fighting took place in the temple cloisters and at the gates of the holy house. The temple courts were lakes of blood and were strewn with corpses. The desire of Titus to save the temple was thwarted by his furious soldiery, so long defied by Jewish desperation. The temple cloisters and gates were set on fire.

Fighting with mad fury Jews and Romans cut each other down in the sacred precincts of the sanctuary. The costly furnishings, the golden vessels, the gates of Corinthian bronze, more precious than gold, were carried away as plunder or vanished in the ruin. Titus was deeply affected by the destruction of the beautiful buildings which he had hoped to save. Conflagration ended the story of Jewish Jerusalem. The holy city, which had risen on the ruins of former capitals and for half a millennium had given its message to the world, now went up to heaven, like Elijah of old, in a chariot of fire.

Vast quantities of plunder were the prey of the conquerors. Property of every sort save food was seized, and prices went down to half their former level. After the fall of the temple and its protecting tower of Antonia, the conquest of the upper city was not difficult. This was the latest of a long series of devastations which Jerusalem had suffered, chief among which were those inflicted by Shishak, Nebuchadrezzar, Antiochus Epiphanes, Pompey and Herod. This event took place in the year 70 of our era, a thousand years after the dedication of the first temple, that of Solomon, on this site, and six hundred years after the completion of the second temple by Zerubbabel. The Romans made thorough work of the destruction. The walls were leveled and the buildings not already burned or demolished were wrecked. The Herodian towers in the upper city were the only exception, and they stand today, mutilated but grim witnesses of the havoc of war.

It is probably no exaggeration to affirm that Jerusalem, which has suffered so many destructions, both before and since that event, has witnessed more human suffering than any other spot on the planet. Tacitus puts the number of slain at 600,000, and Josephus estimates that 1,100,000 people lost their lives in the siege, and that 97,000 were taken prisoners and disposed of as slaves.[21] The trophies saved from

[21] The accounts of Jewish casualties during these bloody years, all the way from the reign of Alexander Jannaeus to the fall of Jerusalem and its attendant horrors, seem incredible. The pages of Josephus are lurid with the recitals of slaughter. Yet allowing for all exaggeration on the part of this annalist, the facts are almost unbelievable. The Jews killed in the wars of Jannaeus are placed at not less than 50,000. In Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem, 12,000 lost their lives. Herod had a long list of victims, public and private, charged against him, among whom were 3000 who protested against the burning of the rabbis in the eagle episode at the temple. Roman officials took a heavy toll of Jewish lives: Gabinius,

the ruin of the temple, such as the table of shew-bread and the golden candlesticks, were reserved for Titus' triumph in Rome, and their representations were carved on his arch of victory later erected at the end of the Forum in the Roman capital.

With this event the Jewish state came to its end. Titus proclaimed a solemn edict banishing all Jews from the holy soil, and forbidding any Jew to enter Palestine. Yet struck with admiration and pity at the stubborn and heroic defense they had made, he asked a group of them what could be done for them. Their leader, the venerable Rabbi Johannan ben Zakkai, replied, " Give us Jamnia and its scholars," and the request was granted. In later days Tiberias and Safed were also centers of Jewish study.

The temple was no more, the priesthood and its ministries were ended, the Sanhedrin had disappeared, and the Sadducees had been dissolved. The Jewish state was destroyed. But Jewish loyalty to the Torah and devotion to its

---

10,000; Varus, 2000 crucified; Cumanus, 10,000; Gessius Florus, 2600, many of whom were crucified; Cestius Gallus, 4000. In the campaign of Vespasian 11,600 were slain at Gerizim, 1000 at Gerasa, 40,000 at Jotopata; 15,000 at Joppa; and 10,000 on his way to sail for Rome; he said that in his part of the war " many ten thousands of the Jews " had lost their lives. Numerous cities taken were the scenes of terrible slaughter, the mere numbers running to tragic totals: such as Askalon, 2500; Ptolemais, 2000; Gamala, 4000; Scythopolis, 13,000; Tarachae, 7700; Caesarea, 20,000; Gischila, 6000; and Joppa, 8400. In Josephus' account one reads repeated references to " great slaughter," " slew a vast number," " perished by heaps," " multitudes of those slain," " no mercy shown," until the mind revolts at the recital, and the marvel grows that any Jews survived the war. But the list of those taken prisoners and sold, or sent to serve on Roman galleys, or as presents to provincial governors, or reserved for death in the arena or for the triumphal procession at Rome runs to an astonishing and depressing total. Nor do these pathetic figures include the multitudes who perished of famine. There is but one bright spot in this long story of death. Titus is reported to have released 40,000 citizens of Jerusalem to go where they might.

study remained, and has constituted through the years the bond of all the widely scattered clans of Judaism. Jewish culture did not die out with the overthrow of its institutions. The nation was gone, but the law remained, and that loyalty which had rallied around the sanctuary with such desperate devotion now centered its affection on the sacred Word, and turned with passionate affection to its elaboration and interpretation. The remnants of the Pharisees who were permitted to remain in the land settled in Jamnia and attempted to make it the center of Jewish loyalty and learning.

A new Sanhedrin was organized, no longer a law court but an academy, and was gradually recognized by Jews in the diaspora. A loyal and successful effort was made to keep alive Jewish beliefs and customs under the changed conditions which the shattering blow of Jerusalem's fall imposed. With fresh ardor the transcendental hopes awakened by the apocalyptic books were cherished. It was not credible that the ideals of Judaism, centering in faith in God and a holy life were to prove frustrate. The teachings of the scribes, in oral form, had already received formulation. These comments upon the law were not written. They were too precious to be endangered by commitment to documents. But in their verbal pattern they were to serve as the core of the Mishna in later days, the heart of the great talmudic literature.

Most of the Jews who survived the fall of Jerusalem and were not enslaved, and those who lived in other parts of Palestine, now sought refuge in other lands as the result of the Roman decree of expulsion from the soil. They fled to Egypt, Nubea, Morocco, Arabia, Persia, Babylonia, China, Germany, Gaul, Spain and Britain. In few of these localities did they find welcome. In most they met ill-treatment and hardship. Naturally they settled in colonies and city quarters by themselves, when they were permitted to remain at all. Here began the ghetto system of withdrawal into precincts where they could find a measure of safety and an opportunity for their artisan and mercantile life. Here their synagogues rose, and their studies and worship afforded intervals of relief from the restraints and oppressions of their daily life. No people in history has ever suffered the repression and hostility which have been in many periods and many lands the lot of the Jews.

Titus enjoyed to the full the fruits of his conquest of Jerusalem. His enthusiastic and devoted soldiery proclaimed him emperor while he yet remained in the city, unmindful of the fact that his father, Vespasian, reigned in Rome. After rewarding his troops from the spoils of Jerusalem he departed for Caesarea with his warriors and captives, taking immense store of booty. He left the tenth legion, the " old guard " in the days of Caesar, to watch the site of the ruined city. In Caesarea he held a series of triumphal shows in honor of his brother Domitian, in which Jewish captives to the number of 2500 were put to death in fights with beasts or gladiatorial combats, or were burnt in the arena. Here Simon, one of the factional leaders in the Jerusalem riots, was delivered to him and publicly executed, and John, his rival, was imprisoned. Going on to Caesarea-Philippi, he held another triumphal celebration, in which similar games and executions were carried on, with Jews as the victims. This was repeated at Berytus (modern Beirut), and on his arrival in Rome he shared with Vespasian and Domitian a splendid triumph in which such of the golden trophies of the temple as had been saved, and a host of Jewish prisoners, graced the procession. These captives later shared the usual fate. The Arch of Titus was erected in commemoration of the Palestine campaign.

There were three Herodian fortresses remaining in Jewish hands when Titus withdrew from the country — Herodeon, Machaerus and Masada. The first was taken by the Romans without a prolonged resistance. The second was captured only after hard fighting in which 1700 defenders lost their lives, and 3000 Jews in the vicinity were put to death. Masada was a stronghold built on a ledge of rock above the western shore of the Dead Sea. It was held by Eleazar, one of the Zealot leaders who had escaped from Jerusalem with a band of followers. They withstood the siege until all hope was gone, then killed their wives and children, and took their own lives.[22] When the Romans gained entrance they found only the bodies of the dead.

Even after the horrors of these years the Jewish spirit was not wholly subdued. So ruthless had been the Roman treatment of the race that the flame of rebellion still burned in various sections of the empire. Revolts against the government flared up in different provinces — Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, Mesopotamia. Liberius Maximus, procurator of Judea, had difficulties with the straggling Jewish population after most of the Romans had departed. In consequence the laws were made increasingly severe. Circumcision was forbidden. No Jew was permitted to approach the site of Jerusalem.

---

[22] Josephus, *Wars,* VII. 8. 9.

In the reign of Trajan there was an outbreak of Jews in Alexandria against the Roman officials, which was quelled in a savage massacre. Even more stringent were the laws issued by Hadrian. An edict of his forbade the reading of the law and the observance of the Sabbath, as well as the circumcision of children. These conditions were deemed intolerable by the Jewish leaders. Their most precious rites were denied them. The result was a fresh revolt in Palestine, a desperate and determined effort to regain a measure of tolerance or to perish. A leader named Joseph bar-Cochba (" Son of the Star ") was proclaimed messiah by Rabbi Aqiba. Coins were struck in his honor bearing the legend, "Prince of Israel." In the war that followed (132–135 A.D.) Jerusalem, which had begun to rise from its ruins, was again destroyed. The remnants of the Jewish forces fled to Bether (Bittir), 10 miles west of the city, where the Romans under Julius Severus cut them to pieces. The town still bears the Arab name of Khurbet el-Yahud (" ruin of the Jews ").

Hadrian removed all landmarks of Jerusalem, and built a new city on the site, which he named Aelia Capitolina. A temple to Jupiter was erected on the temple area, and one to Isis on the traditional location of the holy sepulchre, while an equestrian statue of the emperor was set up near the temple. No Jew was allowed to enter the city on pain of death, nor indeed to appear within sight of it. Every Jew in the empire was assessed two drachmae as a temple tax. The very name of Jerusalem was lost for a century. Jamnia, Tiberias, Sepphoris and Safed alone remained as centers of Jewish culture.

Meantime the city continued to grow under its Roman name. The Christians gradually returned from Pella and the other east-Jordan localities in which they had sought refuge. A bishop was established there, subordinate to the see of Caesarea. The old name of Jerusalem was once more heard. In the reign of Constantine, due to the conversion of the emperor and the pilgrimage of his mother Helena to the holy places, several churches were erected — the Anastasis on the supposed site of the sepulchre, the Martyrion on the spot where the three crosses were said to have been found, the church of St. Eleona in honor of the empress, on Mt. Olivet, and the church of St. Mary at Bethlehem. Christianity was finding its way out into the further reaches of the Graeco-Roman world. But at the same time its sister faith — Judaism — was also becoming a world-wide confession, for as the young Agrippa said to his countrymen during the siege of Jerusalem, "There is no people upon the habitable earth which has not some portion of you among them." [23]

---

[23] Josephus, *Wars,* II. 16. 4.

X

THE JEW THROUGH THE CENTURIES

If the experiences of the Jewish people through the years of their national struggle with Rome and the destruction of their capital were those of martyrdom, hardly less tragic have been the succeeding centuries until recent times. The treatment they received at the hands of their imperial masters set the pattern of the hardships they endured through contacts with other races and in different areas. In all the years of their history they have been an unhappy and persecuted race. They have suffered as the result of their abilities as well as their peculiarities. If they had been less forceful, aggressive, clever and persistent — less loyal to their law and their traditions — they might have escaped the odium and the oppression which they have encountered.

Their dispersion into other lands than Palestine began long before the Roman war. They left the country for many reasons. It is a small land, and has few of the resources which supply the needs of an augmenting population. They emigrated to more promising regions, especially to Egypt and the further reaches of Africa. They were lured forth by the opportunities of trade in the new cities which were springing up in many parts of the empire. They enlisted as mercenary soldiers in foreign armies. They fled from invasion and from civil conflicts. The survival of the Jews as a people after the horrors of the Herodian and the Roman age seems nothing less than a miracle, and such it has often been adjudged. But the wide dispersion of this prolific people offers a more rational explanation. The great numbers of Jews residing in Alexandria, Damascus, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome, not to mention a score of other cities in which they were numerous and influential, in days before the great dispersion from desolated Judea, account sufficiently for their survival and their importance.

In many parts of the empire they extended their influence. By their commercial abilities and success they made themselves indispensable to the ruling classes. Their synagogues were scattered widely through the lands. Where they had no formal meeting places, they gathered for worship in prayer assemblies, as at Philippi.[1] These sanctuaries, formal or informal, were the centers in which they met on the Sabbath and heard the readings from the scriptures, the prayers and the midrashim, or sermons; they were also the places in which early Christian evangelists made use of their opportunity to reach the Jewish population with their message. Being Jews themselves, the first gospel preachers confined their ministries to their own people. Only when controversies and dissensions grew up as the result of this preaching, did they turn to the non-Jews.[2] From this time the Christians found themselves confronted with Jewish opposition and persecution.[3] In these conflicts the Jews usually enjoyed the favorable attitude of Roman officials as being a more numerous and important element in the population, though both Jews and Christians were consistently nonconformist in relation to the state idolatry and emperor worship of Rome. Both were subject to acts of tyranny on account of their respective faiths — the Jews on occasions such as their wholesale expulsion from Italy by Claudius; the Christians in the bloody days of persecution by Nero and Domitian.

---

[1] Acts 16:13.

[2] Acts 18:6. The New Testament records many examples of this synagogue preaching by Christian leaders.

[3] This opposition was not alone from the out-and-out-Jews. It was even more energetic on the part of the conservative Jewish Christians who insisted on keeping the regulations of the Torah, and were intolerant of the more liberal interpretation of the Christian message given by such men as Paul. The

The widespread dispersion of Jews in the empire occasioned embarrassment to Roman officials when several of these scattered colonies made complaint, sometimes armed complaint, against the war in Palestine and the spoiling of Jerusalem. In Cyprus, for example, the Jews were so numerous and warlike that they rebelled, overturned the local government, and slew hundreds in protest against the drastic program of Hadrian in Palestine. In other instances Jewish communities voiced to the Judean authorities their local grievances, as when the Jews in Ionia complained to Herod and Agrippa of official disregard of their rights. The constitution of Caracalla (212 A.D.) granted to Jews the right of citizenship, but on a distinctly lower plane than that accorded other privileged races. The activities of the rabbinical schools in Palestine continued, even in the midst of an unfriendly environment from which the Jewish population had been practically expelled. In the years following the unsuccessful revolt of Bar Cochba, Jamnia (Jabne) fell into neglect, and Galilee was the scene of most of the scholas-

---

Epistle to the Galatians is a commentary on Paul's attitude toward these "Judaisers."

tic activities. A line of distinguished scholars, with Hillel, a Babylonian rabbi as its founder, produced such leaders as Gamaliel II and his grandson, Rabbi Prince Judah (135–217 A.D.) who codified the oral law. But the authority of the Palestine schools was declining, as new centers of learning arose in the east.

Chief among the regions to which the Jews made their way to escape persecution were the lands at the eastern end of the fertile crescent, where in ancient days Assyria and Babylonia had flourished. Into this newer Babylonia there was a decided drift of this people in imperial days. Many of those who were compelled to leave Rome and Italy betook themselves to this region. There were several reasons for this migration. Thither had gone refugees from Samaria when that city fell under Assyrian blows in 721 B.C. Remnants of those colonies doubtless remained in that area, and may have kept up the traditions of the older Hebrew life. Into Babylonia some of the survivors of Nebuchadrezzar's siege of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. had gone, either as forced or voluntary expatriates. The Jews of the imperial age counted themselves in some measure the heirs and legatees of the ancient Hebrew tribes because of their connection with Palestine, although they belonged to a later and different racial stock. The bonds which connected any of the peoples of the Mesopotamian peninsula with Palestine were shared by the Jews of the new migrations.

Babylonia was also inviting because it was in the more remote districts of Roman power. Its perils, whatever they might be, were less appalling than those which proximity to the capital presented to this persecuted race. Colonies of

Jews, therefore, took form in Babylonia, and some of their people turned to the same scholastic pursuits which occupied the attention of the scholars of Jamnia, Sepphoris and Tiberias. These colonies seem to have enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. The government of such distant regions of the empire had suffered from the blows of Parthian, Nabataean and other enemies.

The Jews, although at times they were subject to persecution even in these lands, enjoyed a measure of liberty denied them elsewhere. They still regarded Palestine as their rightful home. They called themselves "exiles." But they organized their institutions on the pattern of permanence, and chose their own officials. The title "exilarch" was given to the administrative head of the community, thus preserving the ideal of an exiled people whose home was elsewhere; and a "resh galutha" or prince of the exiles, who claimed descent from the house of David, held the moral and religious headship, somewhat after the manner of the ancient Hebrew patriarchal organization. By the year 215 A.D. important schools had grown up in Babylonia, and a new and decided movement of Jews from Palestine itself and adjacent countries took place in that direction. Academies were established at such centers as Sura, Nehardea and Pompedita. Through the combined influence of the increasing Jewish population in Babylonia and the widening reputation of these academies, the real center of Judaism during the period from the third to the eleventh centuries was Mesopotamia rather than Palestine. These rabbinical establishments coöperated to a certain degree with the declining academies in Palestine, and the total activity of such seats of Jewish learning resulted in a body of teaching which has been the norm and the pride of Judaism through the centuries — the Talmud.

The scholarly interest of both the Palestinian and the Babylonian colleges centered in the Torah and its exposition. This "Law of Moses," recognized in modern times as coming, not from a single source and a definite period, but as the total legal output of Hebrew culture during the years when the Hebrew state existed, was treated by the scribes as a single and authoritative body of law, mediated to Israel in three great moments of disclosure — at Mt. Sinai, during the years of desert wandering, and at the Jordan in a final rehearsal of the law by Moses.[4] This Torah, with its 613 commands, became the subject of intensive study on the part of the scribes. It was felt that in its classic form it was no longer wholly suited to the times. The fourfold duty of the scribes was to produce copies of the code, to explain its meaning, to elaborate new and protective rules ("setting a hedge about the law"), and to devise means of modifying its restrictions to meet emergencies.

This body of commentation amounting to more than four thousand rules was confined at first to oral instruction, being regarded as too sacred to be entrusted to written form.

---

[4] Modern scholarship, both Jewish and non-Jewish, has generally accepted the view that the Pentateuch (the "Five Rolls," now usually joined with the related book of Joshua, and forming the Hexateuch) presents three codes of law: 1. A primitive code ("J" and "E," Ex. 20–23; 34) dating from the eighth or seventh century B.C. 2. The Deuteronomic code (Deut. 12–26) discovered in the temple in 621 B.C. and probably dating from the reign of Manasseh. 3. The Priest Code, embodying the ideals of Ezekiel's legislation, the Law of Holiness (Lev. 17–26), and the later elaborations of priestly torah, found in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, and brought by Ezra from the east as the basis of his reforming ministry. Cf. Willett, *The Bible Through the Centuries,* chapt. X.

Before 200 A.D. however, Rabbi Judah of Sepphoris compiled his " Mishna " or " repetition " in six volumes. Around the Mishna as the embodiment of the Torah thus revised and interpreted there grew up through the following generations a still larger body of commentation, reflection, theological speculation, dietetic tabus, science, folk-lore, legend, proverbs, fables, homilies and other interesting material, some important and some trivial, some noble and inspiring and some commonplace. This is known as the Gemara. The two works, the Mishna and the Gemara, form the Talmud — the " learning " — which with the Hebrew scriptures, the Old Testament, forms the basic literature of Judaism. It deals with practically every interest of life, religion, philosophy, medicine, art, history, politics.[5]

The Talmud developed in two forms, one in Palestine, the other in Babylonia. Of these the Babylonian was the larger and more important. The Jerusalem or Palestinian Talmud, the foundation of which was the work of Rabbi Johannan of Tiberias, who died in 279 A.D., was never completed. It came to its latest phase in the fourth century of our era. The Babylonian Talmud, much more elaborate in form and contents, was finished in the sixth century. The

---

[5] In this manner the Hebrew scriptures, the Old Testament, was followed by three daughter literatures — the New Testament, the Talmud and the Koran, just as the Hebrew religion of the classic age was followed by three daughter faiths — Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Regarding the Talmud Rabbi Lewis Browne writes: " All the Talmud was accepted literally. From end to end it was universally assumed to be a true and perfect development of the commandments which Moses had taught the Hebrews at the Holy Mountain of Yahveh. The new rabbis commented on its every line and word, striving to make clear its many muddy passages, and only succeeding in making them muddier. So they went on, pathetically caressing their hoard of laws as a miser caresses his coins. The Talmud was no longer their servant, they had become its slaves." *Stranger than Fiction,* p. 198.

Mishna was written in a late form of Hebrew, the Gemara in Aramaic.

It was this great work, the Talmud, which established the pattern of Judaism. It made of the Jewish people a separate and exclusive race. It gave them a confidence in laws of conduct, rules of life, minute regulations of behavior, which set them off from all other people, and provided them with a shell of custom which was at once a protection and a barrier. The study and observance of these rules of life became for the scholarly and the pious a duty, a diversion and a source of spiritual strength. It kept them apart from all others in a multitude of the details of life — food, garments, social habits, forms of worship, as well as fundamental convictions. It kept constantly in the forefront of their thought the belief in their antiquity, their descent from the Hebrew stock. It gave them, accordingly, an immense pride in their past, in their religion and in their anticipated future.

It must be borne in mind that the Jew in all ages has faced the historic struggle between this sense of exclusiveness and superiority, the result of his system of exhaustive attention to rules of conduct, and on the other hand the tendency to a more liberal and tolerant attitude toward life, which first and last has carried a multitude of his co-religionists away from Judaism into other faiths, or into unbelief. In all generations this struggle between rules and principles has been present. It was the basic point of divergence between the teachings of the rabbis and those of Jesus. There has always been danger that the pattern of life laid down by the Talmud, if actually applied, tended to stifle freedom, to narrow the interests of the community, to promote selfishness and to create a sense of reserve and exclusiveness which set the Jew apart from all others in a world of his own. On the other hand no student of history can doubt the enormous influence of Judaism in stimulating loyalty and devotion to an ideal, a sense of satisfaction in the practice of religious obligations, and the attainment of inward peace in the midst of an unfriendly social order. The Sabbath, the Torah and the messianic hope have been to the loyal Jew a solace and a refuge. In the days of his severest sufferings from persecution, his home and his synagogue have offered him a haven of peace and happiness in the assurance of his beliefs, and in the practice of his holy rites.

From the beginnings of their dispersion among the nations, the Jews have confronted also the problem of contact and assimilation with the rest of the world. In spite of all regulations formulated by the synagogue and the schools, intermarriages have been numerous. Judaism has set its face against them, because they drained away an element in its ranks that could not be spared. On the other hand, it broke down that sense of racial integrity, which however fallacious has always been a source of Jewish pride. Yet as Graetz points out[6] marriages between Christians and Jews are a commonplace of social history. From the days of Constantius (339 A.D.), who issued a decree forbidding the marriage of a Christian to a Jewess, the laws of states and the councils of the church have prohibited the practice. The third and fourth Lateran Councils passed such decrees, and forbade Christians from taking service with Jews. Yet all such regulations have been of little value.

---

[6] *History of the Jews,* Vol. 3, p. 54.

In keeping with the generally prevailing sentiment of unfriendliness toward Jews there grew up the practice of compelling them to live in separate sections of cities, which gradually acquired the name of ghettos. The " ghetto " seems to have taken that designation from the fact that the section of Venice occupied by them was called Gietto, " gun factory," from its former use. Such Jewish quarters were found in most cities — the Trastavere in Rome, Old Jewry in London, etc. By the sixteenth century most Jews were forced to live in ghettos. These were usually the least desirable parts of cities. They were crowded, the streets were narrow and dark, and the danger of filth, fire and fever was constant. Naturally in limited areas like these it was difficult if not impossible to build new houses. They were therefore forced to pile story on story, and to live in small unhealthy rooms. The ghetto was a refuge and a prison. The Jew was locked out and locked in. There was a measure of security in a compact community with common interests. Set upon in the non-Jewish parts of a city, he might be able to gain the covert and mystery of the ghetto and hide himself. At the same time the place was subject to attacks from mobs or ruffians intent on plunder, murder or outrage. In most centuries the life of the ghetto was one of repression, restricted callings and constant danger. In most countries Jews were not permitted to hold land, so that agriculture was impossible for them. They had no chance at the soil. Furthermore it was dangerous to live in country districts, away from the measure of protection afforded by their kind in the cities. They were forced to depend on barter and exchange. Even the usual forms of commerce were denied them, and they were obliged to resort to usury and the slave trade.

The causes of this attitude toward the Jew on the part of his neighbors were various. No doubt the foolish superstition regarding his participation in the death of Christ had its place in the complex of factors that set him thus apart. His Jewish faith and habits were objects of derision to people who had no comprehension of his beliefs, experiences and struggles. His industrial and commercial abilities made him disliked by those who were unable to compete with him in skill or cleverness. But perhaps most of all his ill-concealed sense of pride and superiority, his consciousness of a scholarship and intelligence possessed by few of his non-Jewish contemporaries caused them to hate him because they could not enter into his cultural and artisan inheritance. Then too it must be understood that the ghetto itself helped to form the Jewish character. His fear, his evasiveness, his furtive habits, his obsequiousness combined with an evident disdain, were all elements in the forming of a character which was looked upon both as a mystery and a menace. Most of the ungracious traits which set the Jew apart from his fellows today are an inheritance from the ghetto, and the responsibility for their presence and persistence lies far more with his detractors than with him.

But Jewish history is replete with examples of men in high estate, great scholars, poets, statesmen and ministers of empire. Genghis Khan had as his chief adviser the Jew Saleyman, Timur the Tatar was dependent on Judah of Germany, Haidar Shah had a Jewish vizier, Ferdinand and Isabella employed as chancellor the Jew Abarbanel. In modern days Disraeli a Jew, though in profession a conforming Anglican, was prime minister of England, and many Jews have held high office in still more recent times. Those Jews who like to insist on the Hebraic antiquity of their race, point with pride to the traditions regarding Joseph, David, Mordecai and Nehemiah. The list of authentic instances in which Jews played an honored and important part in history is long, as in the case of Isaac, who according to the " Vita Karoli " was the leading factor in negotiations between Charlemagne and Haroun al-Rashid, and who brought an elephant to the emperor as a gift from the caliph. It may well have been his influence which secured an unusual tolerance for the Jews, the only capitalists in Charlemagne's realm in days of anti-Jewish persecution.

Among the humiliations forced upon Jews in many parts of Europe during the middle ages and in later times was the wearing of distinctive marks and garments intended to add to their discomfort and reproach. Among many such were the yellow or saffron hat, the gaberdine, and badges of shame on their breasts. In some lands the men were compelled to wear green caps and the women green veils. This degradation was carried beyond the bounds of Europe into the east. No Jew was permitted formerly to ride in the streets of Bokhara, even though he might be a millionaire. He was compelled to go on foot, wearing around him a strand of rough rope in token of slavery. Fortunately in most self-respecting lands these disabilities have ceased.

It would be strange if one so mistreated in a world dominantly non-Jewish did not react with anger and cruelty against his persecutors. Lurid stories are told of Jewish vengeance upon Christian insolence and savagery, and doubtless all of them may be verified in particular instances. For example there were occasions in which Jews joined in campaigns against Christians, as when Chosroes II of Persia took Jerusalem and massacred many thousands with Jewish help.[7] In a like spirit the Samaritans joined the forces of Hadrian in their attack on the Jews in Jerusalem.

By the age of the crusades the Jews were settled in most of the important cities of Europe. As already noted, the tendency was to forbid them the more honorable types of activity, such as agriculture and commerce, and compel them to adopt the more questionable occupation of money lending. Usury was forbidden by the church, based on the Levitical law.[8] On the same principle Jews did not charge each other interest, but felt free to deal with non-Jews on that plan. The result was that they became the leading bankers and money lenders, and were willing to run the risk of exaction and plunder for the sake of the profits derived. In many instances high interest was charged, and their clients were reduced to economic slavery. But they were the only resort of the distressed. "Usury," which in biblical phrase meant merely reasonable payment for the "usage" of funds, came to denote exorbitant interest charges, and the Jew was the usual and necessary factor in such transactions. The proportion of Jews who were able to lend money was small, but it gave the reputation of hardness and exaction to the race as a whole, and this added to their unpopularity.

---

[7] Regarding Jewish reaction against Gentile treatment of their people Rabbi Lewis Browne writes: "The Jews became the money lenders of Europe. They developed a great shrewdness and cunning in the one and only field of opportunity left open to them, and with their shrewdness and cunning they developed a certain cruelty and greed. That was natural. The world was cruel to them, so when the chance was theirs, they were cruel in return. Their high "overhead" drove them to become usurers, and they charged all the interest on their loans that they could possibly get. There was no other way for them to survive. So many borrowers never repaid their loans, that those who did had to make up for those who did not. And by shrewdness and cunning, by usury and thrift, the Jews managed to crawl and wriggle their way through to wealth. So the Christian world decided that its next task, now that the Jew had been robbed of his pride, was to rob him also of his pelf." — *Op. cit.*, p. 229.

[8] Ex. 22:25; Lev. 25:36, 37; Deut. 23:19, 20; Ps. 15:5.

The money lenders of the ghettos were often the sources from which funds were raised by the crusaders. They were the bankers who financed portions of the undertaking. Peter the Hermit carried an order from the Jews of France to eastern Jews to supply the needs of his expedition. Families of crusaders were often compelled to resort to Jews for funds to send to their absent lords in the east, or to maintain their own households. The ill-will felt toward Jews as the result of these relations, and of many other real or imaginary grievances, chief of which was the fact that they were classed with Moslems, infidels and pagans, led to curious and tragic excesses in crusading days. The first objects of attack on the part of the companies who started eastward to rescue the holy sepulchre from the unbelievers were not the Moslems of Palestine but the Jews of Europe. In the first crusade the cities along the Rhine were the witnesses of anti-Jewish violence and robbery. In Worms the Jews paid Emich, count of Laisingen, a large sum for protection. As soon as he received the money, he led his men to pillage. The synagogues were burned, the Torah desecrated, and 800 of the unfortunate people were massacred.

In Mayance, 1000 lost their lives. Similar outrages were perpetrated in the ghettos of Regensburg, Treves and Prague.

In Cologne a whole company of Jews committed suicide to escape a worse fate at the hands of the cross-bearers. At Metz and Spires Jews were cut down by bands of crusaders " to avenge the blood of Christ." At Altenahr the Jews when menaced selected five of their number who put to death 300 of their co-religionists to prevent a more sinister tragedy. The Jews of Ratisbon sent Godfrey a present of 500 pieces of silver to secure protection. In the second crusade, preached by St. Bernard of Clairveaux, massacres of Jews took place in Germany in the initial stages of the movement. Of St. Bernard himself it was said in extraordinary praise that " he was kind even to Jews." The pope Innocent III in 1207 called for a crusade against Islam and the Jews. In the days of the fourth crusade Jewish homes and warehouses were huddled in the dark alleys along the Galata shore in Constantinople for greater protection. When Godfrey's knights took Jerusalem the Jews slipped furtively through the byways, or fled from the city or shared the fate of the slaughtered Moslems. Historians of the time speak of " those eternal scape-goats, the Jews." In those years Jews and serfs were bought, sold and exchanged like other property. They were even given as slaves to churches by their seigneurs. They were the objects of levy and exaction. The tribute laid upon the Jews of Paris paid off the loan made by St. Louis for his crusade, the security for which was the crown of thorns.

It will be observed from these sinister facts that by the age of the crusades the Jews were widely dispersed through the lands of Europe, and were sufficiently numerous to be an important factor in the population, an object of concern to the governments, and of suspicion and malice to many of their fellow citizens. The story of their experiences in the various lands is of interest. Probably the most impressive chapter is that which deals with Spain. Jews arrived in that peninsula early in the Christian era. Some of them appear to have come from Rome after the expulsion of Jews from Italy under Claudius. Spain was nearer to a homeland for them than any other area. They came from many directions, and their numbers increased rapidly. From as far away as the Jewish colonies in Babylonia they made their way, and soon became a significant element in the population. A new zeal for Jewish scholarship and institutions sprang up there. The traditions of the Jewish schools in Palestine and Mesopotamia revived and flourished. Under Moorish favor poetry and philosophy found fresh impulse among them. Such scholars as Jehudah ha-Levi (1086–1141) and Solomon ibn-Gabirol (1021–1056) exerted widespread influence. Moses Maimonides, physician and talmudist, and others of his order were the centers of increasing circles of literary and scientific interest.

Under the Gothic and later Christian rulers of the land the Jews prospered. With their rapid increase in numbers they bade fair to become the major factor in the population, and might in a few generations have been dominant not only in Spain and Portugal, but across the border in France. They gradually won wealth and influence. They achieved distinction as teachers, physicians, bankers, merchants and diplomats. Literature flourished among them. Cherishing the tradition that they were the descendants of the ancient Hebrews, they even made efforts to revive the Hebrew language, which had disappeared. Spain thus became a new center of Jewish life and culture. One of the results of this new development in the peninsula was the growth of friendly relations with the Moslems of the north African coast. The religious tradition of Spain was Christian. The Roman Catholic church was the accepted religious institution. But Judaism was closer to Islam in its intense monotheism than to the church of Rome. Only the straits divided the two populations, and soon the Moslem Arabs were being solicited by Spanish Jews to cross the narrow water and share with them the opulent tracts of Andalusia.[9]

As early as 709 Jews opened the gates of Spanish cities to Tarik and his followers. From that time the arrival of Moslems from Morocco and other parts of northern Africa was constant. Very soon these Moroccans or Moors, as they came to be called, were an important element in the life of the land. They brought in the civilization of their coreligionists of regions further east, and laid the foundation of that rich culture which blossomed in the Moorish universities, art, architecture and military science of later days. With all of this the Jews in the country were sympathetic. And through this friendship for the Arab invaders they awakened the suspicion and resentment of the Spaniards. When it was found that Jews were plotting with Moslems to bring over fresh bodies of invaders from Africa, and to overthrow the Gothic kingdom in the eighth century, alarm was felt. In fact it was time for Christian Europe to take stock of its dangers. The Moslems, once on Spanish soil, swept on across the Pyrenees and gained possession of all southern France. Carcassonne, Arles, Avignon and neighboring territories were taken by them. It was only the battle of Tours (735) which saved Europe from Islam.

---

[9] Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 485.

Meantime the Jewish population of Spain rapidly increased. Granada was called the " city of the Jews." Seville was largely Moorish, but with a large Jewish population which had its troubles with the Christian element. In the thirteenth century the Jewish population amounted to four or five millions in a total population of thirty millions, and the commercial and political importance of these people was far beyond the proportion of their numbers. Many of them were wealthy, and lived in great luxury. They often held high positions in the state and in the establishments of nobles and even of churchmen. The kings of Spain were glad to borrow funds from Jews on occasion, as Ferdinand did from the rich Jews of Aragon. Many a courtier employed a Jewish physician and astrologer. Alfonso VIII made a Jew his treasurer. The archbishop of Toledo had a Jew as his secretary. Jews farmed the taxes of some of the Spanish cities, after the pattern of ancient Roman provinces. They were useful, and at times indispensable, to the rulers in the administration of government. Jews were in high favor in the Moslem portions of the land. They taught in the Arab universities. Philosophy, astrology, medicine and mathematics were their specialties. Grammar and poetry were among the disciplines they cultivated. It was the golden age of Jewish culture and opulence.

It was inevitable that a people so forceful, ambitious and useful should become in a measure integrated in the life of Spain both by intermarriage and by adoption of Christianity. Mixed marriages became common. Many of the ancient houses in which pure Spanish blood ("limpia sangre") had been the boast, came to have Jewish strains. And since the Jews were often conscious of a wealth and culture which was superior to that of their Christian contemporaries, they frequently exhibited an ostentation and disdain which made them, as elsewhere, the objects of envy, hatred and aversion. The Jews of Spain were living among a people whom in their hearts they despised as less intelligent, and who in turn resented their presence as aliens and extortioners. It was but a step from this friction between Jews and Christians to overt persecution. With the Moors they had at times had troubles. There is record of persecution by the Moslems, and of the massacre of 4000 Jews in Granada in 1066. But in general Jews and Moslems lived amicably. It was the growing power of the church, and the combination of religious and economic differences that led to the tragedies which presently wrote the dark chapter of Jewish persecution into the story of Spain. The Jewish dark ages in that land began with the Renaissance. Increasing hardships fell to their lot. They were compelled to attend church services and listen to the sermons of Christian priests. Their holy books were burned in public bonfires.

To avoid the growing difficulties of their position many Jews adopted Christianity either as a sincere expression of their changed belief, or as a means of escaping the persecution which impended. Massacres of Jews took place in several centers. They were being expelled from important cities. From the year 1400 no Jew was allowed to live in Barcelona. Other communities showed a like intolerance. In their distress many of them turned to the church as to a refuge. Their motives need not be scrutinized too closely. Numbers of their co-religionists were suffering mob violence or official oppression. The church offered them immunity from these disabilities. Great numbers accepted the protection offered.

In Castile more than 30,000 turned to Christianity, and in Aragon 6000 or more. In the whole of Spain not less than 160,000 were baptized. They were called "conversos," or "Marranos," or "Moriscos" (Moorish).[10] They were naturally held in disesteem by the loyal Jews who were willing to endure hardship for the sake of their faith, and they were suspected of insincerity by the Christians. Yet they came to be a powerful company, and attained great influence in church and state. Luis de Santangel, Ferdinand's trusted secretary, was a Jewish convert. In Cordoba Queen Isabella's confessor, Fray Hernando de Talavara, Prior of the Convent of Santa Maria, was the grandson of converted Jews. Bishop Pablo de Sta. Maria of Burgos was a converted Jew. Bishop Juan Arias de Avila of Segovia was the son of Jewish parents. Beatriz de Bobadilla, the most intimate friend and confident of Queen Isabella, was married to a converted

---

[10] These names are sufficiently clear, such as "conversos" (converted Jews), "crypto-Jews" (those who professed Christianity, but secretly were Jews); "Moriscos," (Moorish, Moslem or suspected Christians). "Maranos" or "Marranos" is a name not so easily defined. It has been thought by some to refer to the worship of Mary; by others to have its origin in the Aramaic word "Maran" (Lord) as referring to Christ, in such scripture passages as 1 Cor. 16:22 *maran atha,* "the Lord cometh," or *marana tha,* "our Lord, come." It came to have the significance of "accursed," "banned." Whatever its origin, it became the usual name for Jews converted to Christianity.

Jew, Andria de Cabrera. Many of the Spanish bishops and other clergy were either converted Jews or were of Jewish descent.

It is not strange that the "old Christians" should have regarded the "conversos" with aversion as suspecting their sincerity, and the two groups were in constant conflict. The converted Jews were charged with mockery of the Christian mysteries. "Death to the Marranos," was the cry on the streets of Cordoba in 1467. In Segovia in 1474, "secret Jews," or Marranos, were put to death by mob violence. At times conflict broke out in the churches. Crypto-Jews attacked the cathedral of Toledo, and the "old Christians" were compelled to defend themselves. On the other hand the converted Jews in places of power often harrassed the true Jews with provocative laws and restrictions. The inhabitants of the "Judarias" or Jewish quarters were victims of hardships. In 1405 a rule was made that Jews must wear red circles on their clothing. In 1412 they were forbidden to shave, or to cut their hair round, or to be members of several specified trades.[11]

Charges of all kinds were made against the Jews. The "Black Death" which ravaged Europe for two years, and carried off half its population, was charged against the Jews, who had, it was reported, "poisoned the wells." Mobs set upon these unhappy people in various Spanish cities in fancied reprisal. In Seville 4000 were killed. Charges of ritual murder at the Passover season were made against them, and prolonged judicial hearings were held to consider alleged instances of the sort.[12]

---

[11] Walsh, *Isabel of Spain,* p. 200. Many of them changed their names, like their co-religionists in all lands and all centuries, to escape the odium of their race. Such names as Al-Mukammas, Ibn-Gabirol, Ibn-Sina, Al-Moravides, Al-Mohades, Abrabanel, Maimonides, and many others were either Moorish or Spanish names adopted by Jews. Cf. p. 60, n. 44.

Christianity suffered unaccountably from involvements in troubles of this character, and from the ministrations of pseudo-priests who disbelieved the doctrines they preached, and paralyzed the church's life by their cynicism and mockery. In some places the conversos were so contemptuous of their Christian profession that they openly attended the synagogues and derided the church. The bribing of officials to secure protection was practiced both by Jews and conversos.

Spain's chief religious and political problems in these years were caused by the presence of the Moors, the Jews and the Marranos. The nearest approach to a solution was found in the establishment of the Inquisition, a judicial and ecclesiastical tribunal for the detection and punishment of heresy. It was set up in 1480 in the joint reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. It was the result of the war hysteria caused by the current struggle with the Moors and the fear neurosis generated by the presence of the Jews and the conversos. Heresy became the most terrifying word in the vocabulary. Christianity was powerful in organization, but weak as a moral force in the soul of an ignorant and superstitious people. The Inquisition was intended to remedy the situation caused by the Jewish element in the population. And yet the out-and-out Jews, although they suffered severely from this enginery of persecution, were molested less than the relapsed conversos, who seem to have been the special objects of vengeance. Men who " judaized and apostatized " were victims of particular and searching espionage. Thousands of victims were brought to trial, to torture and the stake as the result of this fanatical campaign.

---

[12] This was particularly true in a case in La Guardia in the district of Toledo, the details of which are given by Walsh, *op. cit.*, p. 350.

The heart and soul of this effort to extirpate " heresy " was Isabella, the queen. A woman of great ability and masterful spirit, she brought her husband and their united kingdom through many serious crises, sometimes by sheer military audacity. But she was at heart a fanatic, devoted to the church and its rites. It has been well said that to her the world was a religious battlefield, and to fight for men's souls through the ministries of the church was her chief ambition. The Jews and the Moors represented all the forces which had opposed the Christian faith in the past. To her they were the embodiment of hostility to the cross. Had not the Jews been responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus, the stoning of Stephen, and the harassing of Paul? Had they not opposed and oppressed the Christians whenever they were strong enough? Had not the Moslems held for centuries the holy sepulchre with pagan contempt for its mystery? In the mind of this able but bigoted woman there was but one answer. The Moors and the Jews must leave the land forever.

In the year 1492 Spain witnessed three events of world significance. In that year Granada, the last Moorish stronghold, fell, after generations of warfare, and the two monarchs watched with satisfaction the departure of the Moorish king Boabdil and his people across the mountains toward the straits and Africa. In that year Ferdinand and Isabella issued a proclamation commanding all Jews, men, women and children, to leave the kingdom and never return. And in that year Christopher Columbus sailed out from the harbor of Lisbon to seek a passage to China, and came back with the news of a new world.

The hand of oppression had been laid more heavily on the Jews as the years of the two sovereigns lengthened. A war tax was levied on all Jews in 1490 to finance the struggle against the Moors. The Jews were expelled from Andalusia in 1482 and from Saragossa in 1486. Large gifts were made by Jews to Ferdinand and Isabella to secure their protection, but in vain. The tragedies of the enforced departure of this persecuted people were heartbreaking. They suggest more recent and equally savage events in the world war. All the roads were crowded. All manner of conveyances and beasts of burden were employed. The proclamation of expulsion forbade the taking of gold or silver, and reports that the refugees swallowed their treasure led to nameless massacres and mutilations. The Jewish population in Spain in Isabella's day shrank from five millions to 200,000. And the sad part of the story is the fact that this ferocious act of expatriation was called " the new Christian movement." As if the spirit of Jesus could have looked with anything but utter grief upon so cruel an injustice toward the people of his own race and affection, or toward any people.

The Jews fled in all directions. Some of them went to Portugal, where they were permitted to settle on payment of a heavy tax. Some went to Navarre in France. Some traveled to the Balkans, others to Saloniki, and still others to Turkey, Palestine and Syria. Considerable numbers went to Holland, to Italy and to England. The economic loss to

Spain from these enforced migrations was enormous, for wherever they went the reputation of Spain as a Christian state fell. The Marranos of Holland, Italy and England diverted large volumes of trade from the land which they had left.[13] Nor did the expulsion of Jews from Spain cease with the edicts of Ferdinand and Isabella. It would seem unlikely that any considerable number could remain in the land after the drastic measures employed for their removal. Yet it is recorded that in the reign of Philip III in 1609 a half million "Moricos" were expelled from the country, entailing great economic loss in its trade. So unfriendly was the sentiment of Europe toward these unfortunate people that the pope Alexander VI was accused of being kinder to them than the Spanish rulers, and was called in derision "the Jew" and "the Marrano."

In other lands than Spain the Jews were suffering under heavy disabilities. Gruesome stories are told of the ruthless measures employed by the king John of England to extort money from wealthy members of the race. The coronation of his brother Richard I in 1189 was the occasion of a massacre of many hundreds of them, and the tactics of John were pursued by Richard in raising funds to pay off his debts. Jews paid heavy taxes, and gave of their own will large sums whenever they were asked on specific occasions. They were a thrifty and industrious people. Yet they were always in danger of sudden violence, of banishment or even death. Gradually, however, their status improved. Spanish conversos, refugees, assisted in the development of trade with the Levant, and materially aided England in the war with

---

[13] Jewish Encyclopedia Vol. XI. p. 501.

Spain in the days of Mary and the Armada, and in the campaigns of the Netherlands against Philip II. Cromwell in 1654 recognizing their value to the state revoked the edicts excluding them, and they came in greater numbers from that time. There were Jews from Spain in Scotland, who came to be an integral part of the population of Edinburgh. While Shakespeare's " Merchant of Venice " probably represents a common sentiment in England regarding Jews in the reign of Elizabeth, owing to the fact that they were under political ban, yet there were few Jews in England to furnish examples of any phase of Jewish life, and when Marlowe wrote his " Jew of Malta," there was probably not a single Jew on that island.

In France there were so many Jews in Languedoc that chroniclers spoke of it as " Judea Secunda." There were periods of persecution there, probably following the example of Spain. Jews were ordered out of France in 1182, but in 1198 the edict was revoked, and they were permitted to return. However, pressure was repeatedly brought to bear upon them to force their departure, and their complete expulsion was decreed in 1394. Of course these measures could never be completely enforced in any country, and many Jews must have remained by reason of their wealth or through family connections with people in high position. In spite of all advances of civilization, however, a considerable anti-Jewish sentiment remains in France.[14]

There was a large Jewish population in Italy in the middle ages. The trading opportunities of such cities as Venice, Genoa, Pisa and Naples lured them from other lands. In Rome there was a considerable Jewish colony, in spite of various edicts against them from the times of Claudius.[15] But the general unfavorable sentiment caused them great distress in many places. Farrara was an asylum for many Marranos who were pursued by agents of the Inquisition. Venice was the scene of humiliations, restrictions, flayings and burnings. The Jews were even forbidden to lend money. Their synagogues were looted and their sacred books burned. There were *autos-da-fé* held in front of the church of St. Mark, in which their books and even their rabbis were burned. One of their number wrote of these events, " All the gates of heaven are closed except the gate of tears." They felt that the Messiah must come, their only remaining hope. Some of them fled to Farrara, some to Genoa, others to Mantua, Milan, or even Cyprus. Many changed their names to Italian forms.[16] Some apostatized to save their lives and property, and drew down on themselves the curse of their more loyal leaders, who denounced "the execrable shame of baptism." In 1516 there was a decree expelling all Jews from Venice. The leading rabbi of a synagogue in Rome begged protection for his people from the new pope, Innocent III. There was an annual occasion, Holy Cross Day, on which Jews were forced to attend a Christian service in Rome, and listen to a sermon.[17] This requirement was not abolished till the pontificate of Pius IX.

---

[14] This was illustrated in the arrest, trial and imprisonment of Captain Alfred Dreyfus of the French army on charge of treason in 1894. A campaign for his reinstatement was immediately begun, and in 1906, after a re-examination of his case by a less prejudiced tribunal, he was completely vindicated.

---

[15] Crawford writes: "The palace used to face the Ghetto, but that is gone, swept away to the very last stone by the Municipality in a fine hygienic frenzy, though, in truth, neither plague nor cholera had ever taken hold there in the pestilences of old days, when the Christian city was choked with the dead it could not bury. There is a great open space there now, where thousands of Jews once lived huddled together, crowding and running over each other like ants in an anthill, in a state that would have killed any other people, persecuted occasionally, but on the whole fairly well treated; indispensable then as now to the spendthrift Christian; confined within their own quarter, as formerly in many other cities, by gates closed at dusk and opened at sunrise, altogether a busy, filthy, believing, untiring folk that laughed at the short descent and high pretensions of a Roman baron, but cringed and crawled aside as the great robber strode by in steel. And close by the Ghetto, in all that remains of the vast Portico of Octavia, is the little Church of Sant' Angelo in Pescheria where the Jews were once compelled to hear Christian sermons on Saturdays." *Op. cit.,* p. 304.

[16] Examples are Montallo, Marogonato, Luzzalto, Acosta, etc.

In Germany the same hostile spirit prevailed. As in ancient Rome, Spain, England and elsewhere, Jews changed their names to escape odium, and to this day a large proportion of Jewish names are German. Jews were driven from Vienna, Cologne, Wittenberg, Hamburg, Trent, Nuremburg and Magdeburg. Their sacred books were publicly burned in the streets of Frankfort and Cologne. Where formerly Jewish banking houses in Frankfort and Antwerp carried on profitable correspondence with the crusading orders in the levant, the spies of the Inquisition hunted them out in Antwerp, Lisbon and other cities. In modern times the same anti-Jewish spirit has prevailed in many parts of Germany. It was fostered in pre-war days by such leaders as Bismarck and Treitschke. Anti-Semitic leagues in Berlin and Dresden have kept alive the sentiment.

In Russia as early as the eighth century a tribe of Tatars came in from the east, adopted the Jewish faith and established a Jewish kingdom. From that time onward Jews found in that land a chance to live, and their industry, thrift and shrewdness won for them success. Presently, however, these very qualities gave rise to irritation on the part of their less alert and industrious neighbors, and restrictive laws were imposed upon them. They were compelled to live in the "pale," a ghetto on a larger scale. Persecution was rife. Pogroms were organized, in which Jews were the victims of systematic attack, plundering, outrage and murder. This was carried on in the name of Christianity, until the chief festivals of the church became seasons of terror to the inhabitants of the pale. To rid themselves of the Jew either by conversion, expulsion or murder was the effort of an ignorant and superstitious population. All the foolish and wicked charges of other lands and other ages were revived. The pogroms of 1903–1906 are vividly remembered. The names of Kisheneff and Odessa will not soon be forgotten. Jews fled from Russia to France, England, America, China, Australia and South Africa.

---

[17] See Robert Browning's satiric comment on this custom in his poem "Holy Cross Day."

The change of government in Russia from the Czarist régime to the Soviet rule has presented a new set of problems to this people. The effort to find in Jewish rural colonies, for which they are quite unprepared, a pattern of life is in most regards as difficult as their former trouble in finding adjustment to the orthodox church. There is no longer religious persecution, but there are economic difficulties which are even harder to meet. The problem of Jewish life in Poland, where by far the larger proportion of Jews in the world reside, is of a different order, but is of equal economic severity. Roumania, Austria, Hungary and other lands have equally grave Jewish problems.

Formal acts of toleration in favor of Jews have been passed in several European countries. Such laws were enacted in Austria in 1782, in Holland in 1796, and in Prussia in 1812. In fact legislation of that character has been adopted in most lands except Russia. Such legislative action has not however served as a preventive of local intolerance where anti-Jewish sentiment is rife.

There are colonies of Jews in Macedonia, who constitute the largest element in the population of Saloniki; in Arabia, where their people have lived since the days of Mohammed, and where whole tribes of Arabs have adopted Judaism; in Persia, where at times they were persecuted by the Zoroastrians; in Bokhara, where they have recently met rough treatment from Soviet and Afghan authorities; in India, especially in Cochin, where there is a group whose ancestors were driven from Amsterdam by the Inquisition, and which includes white, brown and black Jews in separate quarters; in Africa, where from Roman days there have been colonies in Tunis, in Morocco (the Maghrebes), in Abyssinia (the Falashas), in Ashanti and in West Africa; in Mexico and Peru, where martyrs have given their lives for their faith, and in the West Indies, where the last Marranos of the great Spanish expulsion took refuge.[18]

In the midst of these scattered communities of Jews and in times of trouble such as frequently befell them, the messianic hope has never wholly died out, and at times it has flamed brightly. In almost every century some would-be Messiah has risen to claim a following.[19] Furthermore the hope of a "return to Palestine" has animated the souls of multitudes of Jews in distress. A saying has been current among them, a farewell at parting, *H'shanah haba'a b' Yerushalaim* ("next year in Jerusalem").

---

[18] For much valuable information regarding the wide distribution of Jews through the world see Godbey, *op. cit.,* chapts. IX–XIII.

[19] Examples are David Reubini in Portugal in 1626, and Sabbatai Zevi in Turkey in 1776. The learned and revered Rabbi Abravanel, with his message,

The language of the Jews has varied with their localities. In northern Europe and for the most part in the United States, they are of the Askenazim (German) type, and speak the Yiddish (Jewish) dialect, a compound of German, Russian and Spanish, with a slight admixture of Hebrew and English, and printed in the Aramaic alphabet which replaced the Hebrew. In Spain and the lands to which they emigrated thence they are of the Sephardic type (from "Sephared," Spain) and speak Ladino, a south European compound of Spanish and Hebrew. In nearly all lands they speak the language of the people around them.

During all periods of their history the Jews have produced noted scholars and have added greatly to the store of the world's literature. They aided significantly in the preservation and diffusion of knowledge in the days when Arabic culture in Spain was the chief hope of civilization. From the age of Philo,[20] Jewish scholarship, both in the area

---

"the times are evil, the Messiah has not come," predicted that event for the year 1531. Every feature of adventist messianism may be found in the history of Judaism. Cf. A. H. Silver, *Messianic Hope in Jewish History*.

[20] The celebrated Jewish philosopher of Alexandria (20 B.C.–54 A.D.) who was the founder of the neo-Platonic and allegorical school of Judaism, and sought to interpret the Jewish faith in terms intelligible and acceptable to the Greek thought of his age. In the year 40 A.D. he headed a deputation of Jews to Rome to intercede with the emperor Gaius (Caligula) in behalf of his oppressed fellow religionists. In his teachings and writings he affirmed the absolute authority of the Pentateuch, but held that many of its utterances, which were the cause of criticism and even of ridicule on the part of non-Jews, were to be interpreted in an allegorical or figurative sense. The later cabalistic school of Jewish thought, which was influential in the middle ages, derived from him its first suggestions.

of biblical lore and in the wider fields of science and philosophy, was active and serviceable. It produced notable men in the spheres of history and theology. Some of them have been named previously. Solomon ibn-Gabirol (1020–1070), called Avecebron, wrought in the favorable atmosphere of Spain in that age in the interpretation of Greek philosophy to western Europe. He was called the "Living Fountain of Knowledge," turning the Greek sources of philosophy into the Latin of the scholastic world. The Christian authorities of the middle ages were indebted to this order of writings, as to Philo and Plato, for some of their philosophical and theological ideas.

Rashi[21] (1040–1105) lived in France and produced his famous commentaries on the Bible and the Talmud. His work the "Zohar" helped to form the traditions of the mystical Jewish schools, and his writings elicited the approval of such rulers as Alphonso the Wise of Castile and Robert of Anjou. Jehudah ha-Levi (1086–1141) known as "Al-Khazari," produced a widely known Arabic work on Judaism. Moses ben-Maimon, generally known as Maimonides (1135–1204), lived in Cordova, Fez and Cairo. He was physician to Saladin, and had great influence in his court in Cairo and among the Jews in Egypt. His leading works were a commentary on the Talmud in which he made a valuable rearrangement of its materials, and a *Guide for the Perplexed,* one of the most notable Jewish writings of the middle ages. Through his varied scholarship he enriched many fields of learning, and represents the Spanish school of Judaism at its highest level.

---

[21] He received his designation from the leading letters of his name, *Ra*bbi *Sh*elomoh *I*tzchak (Solomon ben-Isaac).

Another scholar of the age was Gersonides (1288–1344), called the "Light of the Exile," who assisted in the transmission of classical literature to his own age. The process was often long and devious. Plato and Aristotle, esteemed the great authorities of the Greek period, were brought to Spain in Latin translations made from Arabic versions, based on Syriac texts produced by Nestorian scholars from Greek originals. And in some instances these Arabic-Syriac-Greek classics were turned into Latin by Jews working through Hebrew translations. It was a mixture of Hellenic, Arabic and Jewish culture.

In the thought of Judaism in the thirteenth century the Cabala had an important, perhaps the all-important, place. It was the mystical interpretation of the Talmud, which derived its impulse from Philo and his successors, but went to fantastic lengths in finding recondite meanings in biblical names, numbers and symbols. Its use of spells, astrology, amulets, magic and incantations formed a bewildering and enchanting field for speculation and conjecture. It was widely influential in certain schools of Christian lore, and many churchmen were interested in it.

The rabbis were often humble men, who worked at their trades and used their leisure time in talmudic and philosophical studies. The day of the priest was gone; that of the rabbi had come. Other well-known scholars in this field were David Kimchi, who taught in the universities of Provence; Abraham ibn-Ezra, traveler and scholar, who produced a commentary on the scriptures; Elijah Levita, who devised the vowel points for the Hebrew text; and Johan Reuchlin, who taught Martin Luther his knowledge of Hebrew. Through the interest of such men as these, some of them Jews and some Christians, the study of Hebrew, which had largely lapsed save in the rabbinical schools, was revived as being essential to all students of the Old Testament, and Hebrew became a recognized discipline in a number of European universities. From that time it has not ceased to hold a valid place in theological education, although in most Christian schools of theology it is no longer a required study.

A notable and influential work of rules for Jewish observance called *Shulchan Aruch,* the "Set-table," was produced by Joseph Karo in 1555, and was by many regarded as of almost equal authority with the classics of Judaism.

A Jewish philosopher of world-wide influence was Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677), a grinder of lenses in the Hague, who was ostracized by his synagogue for his liberal views on philosophy and religion, but is recognized as one of the leading philosophers of the seventeenth century.

Even more illustrious in the story of Judaism is the name of Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786), who translated the Old Testament into German and produced a commentary on the scriptures, which followed Philo's method of rationalizing interpretation. His large personal influence did much to lessen the hardships caused by the vicious prejudice against Jews in Germany. Mendelssohn was the philosopher whom Lessing pictured in his notable work, "Nathan the Wise."

There have been accessions to Judaism from various sources, and defections from it as well. For example a group of Turks, the Kareimenes of the Crimea and of Lithuania, embraced Judaism.[22] There were many instances of conversion to Judaism on the part of negro slaves in days of the Civil war. There are large synagogues of Negro Jews in the Harlem section of New York City. Negro Judaism flourished in parts of the West Indies. On the other hand Judaism has constantly suffered losses, some of which have been mentioned as the result of persecution. Constant defections from the synagogue occurred in Europe after the Napoleonic wars. Names, faith and customs were given up. This was notably true in England and Germany. In Berlin it was reported that one third of the Jews renounced their religion, for political, economic or social reasons. There is a sect of Jews who adopted Islam, and who live in Saloniki. Among the large numbers of Jews who live in the United States there have been many departures, to Unitarianism, and to Christian Science. These are more largely from the orthodox than from the liberal ranks of Judaism. Yet in all periods of its history Judaism, even though divided into various types of orthodox and liberals, and suffering at times the heaviest losses and the severest persecution, has maintained an unwavering testimony to the basic principles of its confession, and exhibited to the world a loyalty to the Torah and the synagogue that commands the admiration of mankind.

[22] Halide Edib, *Turkey Faces West,* p. 8.

XI

THE RISE OF ZIONISM

There has been no period since the beginnings of Judaism in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra in which Jews have not been living in Palestine. In spite of all proscriptive edicts made by Romans, Arabs, crusaders and Turks, members of that race have remained on the soil. In many instances it has been in the face of severe repression and prohibition. There was no police power adequate to the complete execution of any mandate of expulsion. The fact that permission was given by Titus for the continuance of a Jewish school in Jamnia opened the way for other centers, such as those at Sepphoris, Tiberias and Safed and in other parts of the country. Jews in small groups or in family units remained out of sheer love for the land, or the sentiment of despair in the effort to visualize any other home. Usually the attempts to rid the country of this people came in spasms of resentment or nationalistic zeal on the part of the controlling nations, and in the intervals the Jewish exiles crept back to their former homes, or struck fresh roots into the beloved soil. It was never possible actually to banish Judaism from Palestine.

Meantime in Jewish minds both in the holy land and elsewhere the tradition continued and strengthened that the country had once been the unquestioned possession of the Jew, and that in some continuing sense, in spite of other and temporary control, it was his home land. It was not alone the fact that during the five centuries from the origin of Judaism in 445 B.C. to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. the Jew had been the authentic and unquestioned inhabitant of the land, in spite of foreign suzerainty; it was equally true that with or without warrant he claimed to be the legitimate successor of the ancient Hebrews, and the heir to the country in which they dwelt. With increasing persistence the Jew has made himself and the world believe that he is the lineal descendant of the race that for seven centuries from 1200 to 500 B.C. held at first a growing, then a complete, and later a vanishing title to the land. The basis of that claim has been examined in previous chapters. But without question it has been the accepted tradition of the Jew, and with a rather indifferent gesture of assent has been admitted by the rest of the world. In fact most Christians of the traditional type have found satisfaction in the belief that the forecasts of future unity and glory for the Hebrew race freely scattered over the pages of the Old Testament — forecasts rendered impossible of fulfillment by essential conditions unmet and destructive policies adopted — applied equally to the Jew, and were yet to be realized in his return to Palestine and the reëstablishment of his nationality. This is the confident conviction of large numbers of those who are concerned with "the signs of the times," and believe that portentous events are at hand, among which is the return of the Jews to Palestine. Many passages in the scriptures, both of the Old Testament and the New, seem to them to bear this meaning. Here is the point at which Zionism faces its first historic test. Waiving entirely the claim to genealogical continuity with the ancient Hebrew race, it is the conviction of most modern biblical scholars that the Old Testament contains no anticipations of the restoration of Israel to its ancient homeland which can apply to the Jewish people and the present age. There are many passages which express this confident hope for the future as it took form in the thought of the prophets. But that hope was based upon conditions which were not fulfilled historically, and the possibility of whose fulfillment has passed away. One has to stretch the language of prophecy out of all legitimate proportions to secure from it any reference to the Jewish occupation of Palestine or to events in the modern age.

Under varying conditions, therefore, and from varying motives, sometimes merely the desire to remain where they were born, or the sentiment of attachment to the land, sometimes with a measure of official tolerance, and sometimes in peril of oppression, massacre and outrage, Jews have remained in Palestine, and have gradually come to be recognized as an inevitable and even desirable factor in the population. With the exception of those times of ferocious invasion or racial uprising which have been all too frequent in the history of the country, they have lived in their quarters of the various cities and villages, and have carried on their modest industries of village life or of agriculture and herding, such as their economic status permitted. There are no reliable estimates available regarding their numbers in the different periods. During the years since the crusades the dominant population has been of the Arab type brought by the inrush of the Moslem invasion and continued under Turkish rule. The fact that the Turks had adopted Islam as their faith gave to the Arab population and its Turkish official class a semblance of unity, although the Arab has never ceased to resent the passing of power from his own to a foreign race, even of Moslem belief. He has never ceased to hope for the return of the caliphate — the "succession" to the Prophet in the headship of the Moslem world — from the Turkish sultans to men of his own Arabic blood.[1]

In the midst of this dominant Turko-Arabic element the Palestinian Jews have lived for centuries, a politically impotent minority — until recent years about one-tenth of the total population — but on fairly friendly terms with their neighbors, who included many other small racial groups.[2] These Jewish dwellers in Palestine have been of several different sorts. First, there has been the pensioner class — Jews either of the Askenazim type, chiefly from Poland, Germany and Russia, speaking Yiddish; or those of the Sephardic type, from Spain, Portugal and other Mediterranean lands, and speaking Ladino. These Jews are supported in large measure by benevolent funds provided by their co-religionists in western Europe and America. It is the accepted theory that by their devotions at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem they are representing all Jews the world over, in commemoration of the Jerusalem that is no more, and in hopeful expectation of the city which is yet to be. Of the large amounts spent for relief work in behalf of indigent Jews in eastern Europe and the near east in recent years a considerable proportion has been devoted to this type of Palestinian benevolence. In Jerusalem the pensioner Jews live chiefly near the Wailing Wall in the Jewish quarter — one of the four quarters into which the walled city is divided, the Moslem, the Jewish, the Armenian and the Graeco-Latin. The two synagogues, red- and blue-domed respectively, are conspicuous objects in this section. These Jews are generally distinguished by their peculiar long garment, the gaberdine of the middle ages, and their fur head-coverings, survivals of days when they were symbols of oppression. Many of them wear the characteristic side locks. They are the least impressive members of their race.[3]

---

[1] With the overthrow of the Turkish empire, the deposition of Sultan Abdul Mejid and the assumption of power by the dictator, Mustapha Kemal Pasha, the caliphate ceased. It is the dream of the various Arab states that at a congress to be called in the near future a caliph of authentic Meccan blood may be chosen as the real successor to the Prophet. For a brief period Husein, the late sheriff of Mecca and "King of the Arabs" proclaimed himself caliph. But this was hardly more than a temporary gesture.

[2] See p. 34, note.

The second type of Jews to attract attention in Palestine belongs to the agricultural and industrial class, which, before the days of Zionism, was located by generous members of their race in portions of the land which promised them homes and openings for a career, or who came of their own accord to secure the opportunities which the land offered. Jews were not the first to try such agricultural and economic experiments. Palestine has been regarded as a refuge and an opportunity by various companies of people in modern as well as ancient days.[4] Naturally the country always attracted the attention of unprovided Jews and those who had the ability and inclination to assist them. As far back as the middle ages the sultan at Damascus asked the emperor Suleiman for the gift of Tiberias and seven villages around it as a possession for Jews who were homeless and in distress. The motive of relief has stirred the thought of many resourceful Jews who were troubled by the spectacle of their fellow-religionists suffering and unprovided in various parts of Europe. Many experiments of the sort have been made. Efforts to plant agricultural colonies of Jews in the Argentine, in Mexico and in other parts of the western world have been carried on by such philanthropists as Baron Moritz von Hirsch, who devoted many millions of dollars to the attempt to found a Jewish colony in South America. Circumstances however stood in the way of this particular enterprise. But it is an example of what many generous-spirited Jews have planned in behalf of their people.

---

[3] There are other settlements of Jews in and near Jerusalem, representing particular sects, or in some cases localities from which they have come. Among them are found a group of Karaites (Karaim), a small sect dating from the eighth century, followers of David Karo, who reject the Talmud and hold to the Old Testament scriptures alone, most of whom came from the Crimea; a small underground synagogue of the Chassidim, of Polish pietistic origin; a company of Yemenite Jews, from south Arabia, claiming to be descendants of the tribe of Gad. They are dark in color, like the Bedouin, and speak Arabic with an admixture of Hebrew. Of still smaller sects there are the Bokharans and Georgians from Turkestan, and the Syrian and Baghdad Jews, more like the Arabs than others of their faith. The village of Artuf, a short distance from Jerusalem, is inhabited by a group of Bulgarian Jews.

Western Jews, in Europe or America, who have stood in need of this order of relief, have been satisfied in a measure to try any locality where the adventure might be organized. But Jews in eastern lands have kept their eyes steadily fixed on Palestine as a refuge from the disabilities under which they suffered. It was not strange therefore that attempts at colonization should be made in that land.

The first notable effort in this direction was made by

---

[4] Examples are found in the prosperous German Templar colonies located near Haifa, in Jerusalem, and in the north of Palestine; the so-called American Colony in Jerusalem, founded by Horatio Spafford in 1881, the Oliphant Community at Haifa, etc.

Baron Edmond de Rothschild in 1882. He and his brothers had been impressed with the need of help for their suffering people in eastern Europe, and had planned to petition the sultan of Turkey for permission to settle some of the unprovided Jews as agriculturists in the less resourceful portions of Syria. This would release them from the degrading conditions of ghetto life in Poland and Russia. With this purpose in view Lawrence Oliphant went to Palestine to find suitable areas for this project, where the presence of immigrant Jews would be least likely to arouse opposition from non-Jews or the suspicion of the Turkish officials.[5] Through his efforts and the generous support of the Rothschilds, a settlement called Rischon le Zion was established near Jaffa in 1882, and was supported by the Baron until his death. The will of the Baron Moritz de Rothschild provided funds for the Jewish Colonization Association, which was intended to assist the Jews of eastern Europe in securing homes. Oliphant spent many years at Haifa and on Mt. Carmel, and wrote interesting descriptions of the region and its people.[6] Similar philanthropic activities were undertaken by Sir Moses Haim Montefiore, who in addition to many other services in behalf of his race, founded a Jewish settlement near Beth es-Sultan, west of Jerusalem.

The third class of Jews in Palestine is the commercial group, now rapidly increasing in numbers. During recent years it has been evident that Palestine is to be one of the most interesting and important of tourist regions. As the holy land of Jews, Christians and Moslems it attracts great numbers of visitors — ministers, rabbis, teachers, students and travelers of every sort, eager to enjoy the rapidly improved facilities for the understanding of the country, its people and its problems. This situation has made strong appeal to the commercial ambitions of Jews as well as other races. Because of the special interests of the Jew in Palestine the proportion of men of this race who have taken advantage of business opportunities has been large. There is much to be done in caring for the tourist traffic and other types of trade. Hotels, automobile and truck transportation, railroad equipment and service, the shipment of Palestine products like oranges, olive oil and the hundred other commodities of the land, the trade in goods of every sort needed by residents and visitors, building materials and labor and the many forms of industry that have sprung up in recent years, have offered to the alert Jews of Europe and America, particularly since the war, opportunities of great variety and value for the investment of capital, skill and labor. A new city has grown up outside the walls of Jerusalem, where the larger portion of the community is now located. Similar conditions prevail in other cities like Jaffa, Haifa, Nazareth and Bethlehem. And while men of many nationalities have profited by these signs of progress under vastly improved governmental conditions, the Jew has probably had more than an equal place in the development of the land. And this is the case without reference to the very great changes and opportunities which Zionism has brought.

---

[5] Sir Valentine Chirol, *In Eastern Lands,* chapt. 3.

[6] *Haifa, or Life in Modern Palestine; The Land of Gilead with Excursions in the Lebanon; Memoir of the Life of Laurence Oliphant and of Alice Oliphant his wife,* by Margaret Oliphant.

The fourth class of Jews in the country, and quite the most interesting of all, is the Zionists. While it is true that many Jews of the classes already named are sympathetic with the Zionist aspirations, and involved more or less in the enterprise, yet Zionism deserves to be studied as a phenomenon unique in character, and sufficiently important apart from every other Jewish interest in Palestine. And this statement implies the fact that there are many Jews in Palestine belonging to the classes already named who have no interest in Zionism, and some of whom are definitely hostile to it. In this they are like those of their race in other parts of the world, where Jewish attitudes toward Zionism vary from keenest interest and sympathetic coöperation to entire indifference or even radical opposition.

The first movements of a Zionistic order were made in Russia, due to the oppression under which Jews were suffering in that land. An organization called Khovévé Zion (" lovers of Zion ") was projected in 1881, about the period of the accession of the czar Alexander III to the Russian throne. Its aim was the colonization in Palestine of Jewish refugees from Russia and neighboring lands. There were similar societies in other countries. For example Mikweh Israel, a Jewish agricultural school and settlement, was founded by the Alliance Israelite Universalle, a French society, in 1870. The movement developed into the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association. With the help of the Rothschilds several new colonies were planted, including Zichon Jacob, southeast of Haifa, named in honor of the father of the Rothschilds; Rosh Pinah, between Tiberias and Safed; and Rehoboth, south of Zichon Jacob, founded in 1890. These colonies were occupied by Jews from Roumania.

Considerable land was acquired from the Arabs and other owners, and many immigrants came.

In the meantime interest was aroused in the revival of Jewish culture in Palestine by members of the race who were not particularly concerned with the plan of colonization. Achad Ha'am (who took the name Asher Ginsberg) devoted his life to the spread of the Hebrew language, which he wrote and spoke as long as he lived. He was distrustful of the growing interest in Jewish nationalism, and regarded Palestine less as an opportunity for colonization than as a "fixed national spiritual center of Judaism." Of like mind was Ben Yehuda, whose interests were those of a lexicographer, and who sought to give to the Hebrew language a standard modern form. These men and others of like mind were often called "spiritual Zionists." It was their ambition to revive Hebrew culture in Palestine, and restore the rules of the *Shulchan Aruch* of 1564 to their rightful place among Jews of the living generation. To such cultural efforts there was much opposition by orthodox Jews, who regarded all such activity as secularizing and sacrilegious.

As a result of the organization of the Jewish Colonization Association and the promotion of immigration and colonization the movement gradually took on a political and practical character. This phase was definitely represented by the Viennese journalist, Theodore Herzl, who as early as 1860 was stirred by the anti-Semitic agitation in eastern Europe, and desired to facilitate the removal of the persecuted Jews in Russia, Austria and Germany and their settlement in Palestine. The publication of his book *The Jewish*

State introduced the political and nationalistic phase of the enterprise and resulted in the founding of the Zionist organization in 1897. Herzl was at once hailed as leader, and for eight years devoted himself to the propaganda of political Judaism and the strengthening of its organizational outreaches. It is not evident from his writings that he was interested in the problem of Palestine's capacity to become a homeland for the many millions of Jews who were in need of better economic conditions. It is a fact well known that Palestine has never been capable of supporting the natural increase of any people who controlled it.[7] It is a small land, with limited resources of every sort, pastoral, agricultural or mineral.[8]

Enthusiastic Zionists have estimated its capacity at four millions of population, under the best conditions of irrigation and development. The High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, a sympathetic official, set the figure at two millions of population. Ambassador Morganthau thought that one million was nearer the mark. Of course no Zionist has claimed that Palestine could accommodate the sixteen millions of Jews in the world today. All that was planned was its possession as a homeland by such Jews as were in direst need of such opportunities. All the more therefore is the Zionist worthy of admiration and encouragement, when he deliberately faces these difficulties and manifests his determination to conquer nature in the realization of his racial hope. Nothing less than magnificent patience, courage, toil and treasure can avail to bring to fulfillment this cherished ideal. The fact that such a large and purposeful body of

[7] Godbey, *op. cit.,* p. 174.

[8] See pp. 28, 32.

Jews is committed to the enterprise and is willing to sacrifice to the extent necessary to bring it to fulfillment compels all who look on at the attempt to maintain the attitude of impartial if not friendly attention. Considering the fact that according to the census completed in November 1931 the Jewish population numbers 172,000, and the non-Jewish, 1,133,154, the problem which Zionism faces is not of small dimensions. Undeterred by these or similar considerations, if they were even understood, the plan was adopted, and the world-wide movement launched with enthusiasm.

The event which stimulated Zionist imagination to an extraordinary degree was the Balfour declaration. In recognition of the large aid rendered by patriotic Jews to the British government in its war operations and impressed by the evident tokens of Zionist interest in Great Britain, Lord Balfour, British foreign minister, in November, 1917, wrote to Lord Rothschild that . . . "His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." It is true that this declaration was never submitted either to the nation or to parliament. But it was accepted at once by the Zionists as a pledge that their dreams had at last come true. Perhaps it was impossible for even the most astute of their leaders to understand all the reasons which led to the declaration — the distractions of the world war, the gratitude felt for the generous help which the government had received from members of the Jewish race, the placing of one of its distinguished statesmen in the position of High Commissioner to administer the affairs of Palestine under the mandate, and other considerations less obvious. But there was no doubt regarding the deep satisfaction felt by all Zionists, by most Jews throughout the world, and by great numbers of Christians, who believed themselves witnesses of the fulfillment of the prophecies relating to the return of Israel to its ancient inheritance. That multitudes of Jews should at once respond to the declaration with preparations for immediate departure to Palestine was to be expected. The tide of immigration rose at once. In that and other facts involved in the movement lay the causes of inevitable misunderstanding and conflict. Most of these were due less to Zionist zeal than to the failure of those responsible for national policies to consider all the facts involved, and to avoid obligations which are today the patent cause of misunderstanding and conflict. For there were other and apparently contradictory commitments made with equal official approval by the British government, which gave pause to the eager Zionist projects.[9] The immediate result of Lord Balfour's announcement was the uniting of political and spiritual Zionism and the gradual submersion of the latter in the former.

---

[9] This phase of the subject will be discussed in the following chapter. The term "Zionism" is derived from the name Zion which was the designation of the eastern or temple hill of Jerusalem (Moriah) and was used in a general way for the entire city, or even for the sacred community as a whole (2 Sam. 5:7; 2 Kings 19:31; Pss. 87:5; 102:21; Isa. 4:3; 24:23; Heb. 12:22; 1 Macc. 4:37, 60, etc. It was not until the time of Constantine and later that the name was applied to the western hill or upper city.

Perhaps no enterprise in history has been more ambitious, or has required more sacrifice and heroism for its achievement than the project undertaken by Zionists. It contemplates the arrival of a large body of Jewish immigrants whose coming shall solve the problems of congestion and oppression in the lands of the pale and the ghetto, and at the same time supply the man-power needed for the agricultural and industrial projects contemplated for Palestine. On the basis of the agricultural colonies already organized by the older colonization society, some of which, like Petach Tikveh, completely failed at first, a large number of new colonies, of many different types, have been planted and developed.

The Jewish immigrants to the holy land feel themselves commissioned to save the land itself from the waste and ruin of centuries. Under Turkish rule, which was Moslem but not Arab, the natives were subjected to every sort of oppression and misrule. Taxes were levied on every spot of arable land and every fruit-bearing tree, until in sheer effort of the peasants to escape spoliation the trees that did not yield enough to pay the taxes were cut down. It is not strange that deforestation has been one of Palestine's curses. War, earthquake, unskilful tillage, the fear of banditry have conspired to reduce the country to a fraction of its possible productiveness. The coming of the British mandate has brought to an end this reign of plunder and devastation, under which Jews and Arabs alike suffered.

For the new plans of improvement in all these directions great credit is due the Zionists, and their coming has been a blessing to the entire population. With the marked releases of opportunity and energy possible under the new mandate régime, almost any population should awaken to life and hope. But the Zionists by their initiative and even more by their funds have opened a new era in the history of the land. That they regard this as providential, the answer of God to the prayers of generations of their people, and the open path to the achievement of their historic mission, is both natural and opportune. The redemption of Palestine from the hands of another race, and particularly such a race as the Turks, was a consummation devoutly to be wished, and the enlistment of Jewish soldiers in the armies of the allies was proof of this devotion to what was deemed a patriotic cause.

Just outside of Jaffa where in 1909 there was only a stretch of sand, a Zionist city called Tel-Aviv has grown up, with all the features of a modern community and with a population which at the peak of its growth reached 45,000. It is the claim of Zionists that whereas before the world war there were forty-five Jewish villages, with a population of 10,000, there are now 120 such villages and colonies, with a population of 150,000. These colonies are some of them of the communal or socialistic type, and some are of the older or conservative order. Naturally the Zionists have desired to settle in the lands best suited to agriculture, such as the coastal plain, the region of Haifa, the plains of Esdraelon and Jezreel, some portions of the Jordan valley, and the upper Jordan area from Tiberias to Lake Hulah. The land has been bought often at high prices from the Arabs and other owners. This has made such transactions as desirable to the Moslem possessors as they have been necessary to the Jews. The money for this purpose has in some instances been supplied by the colonists themselves, as at Nathania. In other instances it was borrowed from the Zionist agencies, and the effort is being made to repay the loan, as at Daganiah, but as yet with small success. In some cases the land was purchased by the American Zionist Commonwealth, as at Affulah on the Nazareth railroad.

All the post-war colonies are operated on the coöperative principle, where the land is worked in common and without hired labor (moshve oudim), as at Nahalal, Balfouria and Tel-adas, or on the pure communal system (Koutzah), where everything is owned in common, money is not needed, and children belong to the community and are kept in the village *creche,* though they may be returned to their parents at times. Such is the situation in communities like Ein Harod, Kirjath Anabim or "Dilb," Tel Joseph, etc. The numbers in the colonies vary from 7000 in Petah Tikweh or 2000 in Rehoboth to 200 in Balfouria and Merharia. The yields are oranges, grapefruit, wine, almonds, melons, dairy products and tobacco. The standards of living as reported by careful observers, appear to be higher in the older and more conservative colonies than in those of the later and communal type.

While the effort has been made to secure land suitable for agriculture and horticulture yet some of the localities are very poor, and hard work is required to obtain returns from waste or marshy land. The faith and courage with which the Zionists have gone into such enterprises have been worthy of admiration. Palestine is a very little country. It has a very limited amount of arable land, even under the best conditions of irrigation and cultivation. Large areas are mere desert. The biblical pictures of the country as a "land flowing with milk and honey" were drawn by desert dwellers, to whom it seemed like the garden of the Lord. It is only by hard work that its indifferent or stubborn soil can be made to yield a return to the farmer or even the herdsman. It demands men and women of real courage and the adventurous spirit to carry on an enterprise of this sort. The visitor is often struck with the evidences of hardships endured, meagreness of equipment and opportunity, and of actual seasonal failure; and at the same time with the courage, optimism and idealism of many of the people. The Zionist agencies are not always able to assist adequately in the support of the colonies, and there is always the question as to how continuous and adequate may be the income of funds from abroad to carry on the enterprises in view.

Aside from this very important work of the colonies, there are other ambitious projects included in the program of Zionism, for which large outlay will be required, and from which returns are expected. The mineral resources of the Dead Sea are to be developed, with large expectations from the salt, potash and bromine available. Much is expected from the creation of private corporations for the development of industries such as the citrus fruit exchange, mortgage institutions, engineering and construction companies, credit corporations, etc. The Zionists confidently expect a steady and increasing stream of Jewish immigration, which, although hardly suitable for large agricultural projects, may be counted on to swell to sizable proportions the urban population, which requires little investment per capita and little land and water. Raw materials will have to be imported, but this is not regarded as a serious problem. Such enterprises as the Haifa harbor improvement, the projected pipe line from the Mosul oil fields, and the fact that Palestine is a central distributing point for Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia are regarded as elements of encouragement in the economic progress of the country. These confident forecasts need to be balanced against other factors in the situation, such as the political conditions, the presence and disquietude of the large Arab majority in the country, and the manifest perplexity of the British government in interpreting satisfactorily the Balfour declaration.[10]

Perhaps the most impressive feature of the Jewish revival in Palestine is in the area of education. The rise of Zionism brought immediate activity in providing schools for the Jewish children already in the land, for those who were expected as the result of the anticipated Jewish immigration, and even for the Arab population which it was hoped might profit by the progress in educational facilities. The work already accomplished is far more extensive than any school program undertaken in Palestine in the past.[11]

But the crowning Zionist educational enterprise is the Jewish university on Mt. Scopus.[12] The corner stone of the

[10] See the following chapter.

[11] According to the latest reports there are in the country at present 117 kindergartens, 95 elementary schools, 4 secondary schools, 4 technical schools, 4 schools for teacher training, several agricultural schools like the one at Moza, west of Jerusalem, 3 musical schools, besides theological seminaries at Hebron, Safed, Jerusalem and Tiberias. There are 27,000 Jewish children in schools, 19,000 of them in Zionist institutions.

[12] It bears the name of the Hebrew University, which to those who recognize the distinction between the ancient Hebrews and the Jewish race would seem to be a misnomer. But recognizing the eagerness of the Zionists and of

institution was laid by Chaim Weizmann, one of the conspicuous Zionist leaders, just after the close of the Palestine campaign, in the presence of General Lord Allenby and other distinguished guests. Ten acres of land on Mt. Scopus were purchased for the site, and the buildings were begun. The first units of the institution were devoted to the medical, microbiological and chemical institutes. Much of the money for these beginnings was provided by the American Jewish Physicians Committee. On April 1, 1925, the University, hardly more than an embryo at the time, was brought to birth with opening ceremonies in which Lord Balfour was the chief figure. Since that time new buildings have been added, chief of which is the Wolffsohn Memorial Library, named in honor of one of the men chiefly concerned in the project. The building was dedicated April 14, 1931. Others are the Institute of Jewish Studies and the Institute of Physics and Mathematics. An open air theatre situated on the eastern slope of the hill looks out over the picturesque Jordan valley and the Dead Sea.

A numerous and competent faculty has been gathered, the beginnings of a worthy library have been assembled, and students have come from many directions to pursue studies at this new center. It is proper that in a country like Palestine the first attention should be given to subjects relating to the public health. But such appropriate disciplines as Semitics and archaeology are not neglected. It is the ultimate purpose to complete the program of the institution

---

many other Jews to relate themselves to an antiquity long ago lost, and also the wish to revive in the university the type of Hebrew culture which is the chief pride of the Jew, one can easily understand and excuse the use of the term "Hebrew University."

with the full equipment and curriculum of a modern educational institution of the first class. It will be the purpose of this foundation to re-create after centuries of comparative silence the traditions of Jamnia, Sura, Pombidita, the Moorish universities and the French and Rhenish academies, and to provide for Jewish students an institution to which not only those of their own faith may resort, but as well scholars of Christian and Moslem association for study in an atmosphere particularly adapted to work in biblical, talmudic and koranic subjects. The University is the realization of the hopes cherished by Herman Shapira, a professor in Heidelberg, who first conceived the idea.

The institution is particularly fortunate in having for its chancellor Dr. Judah L. Magnes of California, whose academic history includes the University of Cincinnati, the Hebrew Union College and studies in Berlin and Heidelberg.[13] His contact with Jewish villages in Galicia and Russian Poland, and his experience as rabbi in Brooklyn and New York City gave him an insight into the problems of Judaism and the needs of his people. His election as chancellor of the University opened to him a field of immense opportunity, and at the same time one of extraordinary difficulty. His statesmanlike and constructive spirit has made it impossible for him to satisfy the rabid element in Zionism which is intolerant of the Arab majority in the land, and insistent on aggressive measures for the complete and immediate realization of all the possible implications of the Balfour declaration. Dr. Magnes is able to satisfy neither the extreme radicals nor the extreme conservatives. On the occasion of the delivery of his inaugural address at the University a portion of the audience hissed his words, and insisted that a bolder attitude should be assumed toward the Arab element in the land and the British administration. Dr. Magnes has made his position clear at all times. He has three demands in his program: the right of Jewish immigration to Palestine, the right to settle on the land, and the development of Jewish life and culture. If his leadership can be followed, and his conciliatory attitude adopted by Zionist leaders, there would seem to be excellent grounds of hope for an amicable adjustment of Zionist-Arabic differerences. If not, the situation is perilous and the future a problem.

---

[13] See an article by S. R. Harlow in the Christian Century for Aug. 12, 1931, "*A Portrait of Judah L. Magnes.*"

Among the ambitions of Zionism are the development of the Hebrew language, a Hebrew press and a Hebrew theatre. The first of these projects is attended with great difficulty, as every student of language can understand. No one who has had any experience in the revival of an old language like Latin, Greek or Gaelic, or in the promotion of a new one, like Volapük or Esperanto, will wonder at the difficulties encountered or the limited success attained. It is the plan and effort which stir one's imagination. The Hebrew language, whose classic literature is confined to the Old Testament, has an extremely limited vocabulary, in which almost none of the scientific, technical words of the modern world have a place. A new terminology is therefore in process of construction under the direction of a Board of Language. The result is not the elaborate dignified Hebrew of the Hebron and Tiberias schools, but a new Hebrew for the new Jew of the secular, modern type. The pronunciation is a further problem. In the American schools of Zionist type where Hebrew is taught as a vernacular, the Askenazim or Russo-German system prevails. But in Palestine the Sephardic method is regarded as superior, which fact presents a real difficulty. But this is only one of many problems encountered. Hebrew as spoken in Palestine faces the disabilities of variety of pronunciation, limitation of vocabulary, and the constant intermixture of other and more familiar forms of speech. It is a common saying among Jews there that other Jews speak very poor Hebrew. This is true between Jews of different national groups. Within those circles the customary language of the group, German, Russian, English, French or Yiddish is spoken because it is easier. Hebrew as spoken in Palestine as yet is hardly a language at all such as would be recognized by teachers of classic Hebrew. It is a *linga franca,* or language of accommodation. In fact three types of language are met in Palestine today. First, the group speech of the different nations from which Jews have come, English, French, Arabic, etc. Second, the jargon tongues, like Yiddish, Ladino, Jewish-Arabic, etc. Third, the modern Zionistic Hebrew, which is used chiefly for business and social life when no other is available. A noble effort is being made to revive the Hebrew tongue in its pure and sonorous form, but it is a process of great difficulty, and is by no means successful as yet.[14]

The Hebrew theatre in Palestine is rendering excellent service in the popularization of the new speech. Yet its reach is limited, either through the regular drama or in the talking moving pictures, and it is remarked that half the audience is busy explaining to the other half the words of the play. At the same time the effort to introduce Yiddish films at Tel-Aviv has met with instant and violent opposition as calculated to endanger the Hebrew speech movement. The Jewish press is another feature of the cultural activity which is proceeding in Palestine. This includes the journals now being issued in English and modern Hebrew, and the publications of members of the University staff.

---

[14] Cf. an article by Vincent Sheean, *The Hebrew Revival,* in Asia for December, 1929, pp. 935–41.

Naturally there are various attitudes toward Zionism on the part of Jews both in Palestine and in other lands. The majority of Palestinian Jews are favorable, some of them intensely and even fanatically so. They are the ones who profit most immediately by the movement, and are in position to see its progress. A large portion of these Jews are inspired with the conviction that the land belongs of right to their race, and that they are only returning to take possession of it again after centuries of exile. No doubt this has encouraged in some of them an attitude of possessorship amounting to arrogance and insolence in their contacts with the Arab people in the land. It would be strange if this were not the case in certain instances.

Yet all Jews in the land are not of this mind. This is particularly true of the members of the older colonies whose relations with their non-Jewish neighbors have been disturbed by the aggressiveness of some of the Zionist propaganda. It may be affirmed with confidence that all save an unimportant minority of the Jews in Palestine are favorable to the Zionistic program, and hopeful of its success. Many of them are intensely serious in their demands for immediate realization of all the features envisaged by them in the Balfour declaration — such as unlimited Jewish immigration, Jewish control of the governmental agencies in the land, including both sides of the Jordan, and the carrying out of the mandate stipulations in a manner which shall leave no doubt in the mind of the Arab population that the future of the country lies with the Jew.

A much smaller group is sensible of the difficulties which the British government is facing in its effort to fulfill promises made both to the Jews and the Arabs. This type of Zionist is prepared to exercise patience, knowing that the problem of securing amicable relations between the Arab majority and the Jewish minority is one of great delicacy and difficulty, and that the danger most to be deprecated is the arousal of Arab fanaticism and hostility. The combined Arab states contiguous to Palestine have a population of not less than nine or ten millions. No police force which Great Britain might be able to summon would be adequate to the protection of Jews in Palestine against the aggression of an aroused and belligerent Moslem population in Transjordania and the near-by Arab states. There must be an amicable method of meeting the situation. This is the attitude of Chancellor Magnes and of men of his moderate and constructive point of view. Will they be allowed to work out their program of Jewish-Arab coöperation, or are there to be further scenes of riot such as the Wailing Wall episode of August 1929?

In Europe and the United States there are the same varieties of opinion among Jews regarding Zionism as in

Palestine, although by no means in the same proportion. It is not going beyond the facts to say that the majority of Jews in the world are as yet uninterested in the project or are opposed to it. In eastern Europe where they have suffered most from anti-Semitism they are favorable to any plan which promises amendment of their condition, without more than an emotional reaction toward the Palestine project. In England there is on the whole a favorable attitude, chiefly due to the traditional view regarding Jewish antiquity and the biblical anticipations of a national return to that land. Such vagaries as Anglo-Israelism have likewise had their effect. But most of all English Jews are convinced that the British government is committed to the Zionistic program by the Balfour declaration, and they want to see its provisions carried out. There are numbers of Jews who have reached high positions in British official life, including such men as Sir Herbert Samuel, recently High Commissioner for Palestine, Rufus Daniel Isaacs (Lord Reading), recently viceroy of India, Lord Malchett, and several well-known journalists. Whatever the attitude of such men may be regarding the particular policies of Zionism they are in position to be of great service to Jewish interests at home and abroad.

In the United States opinion appears to be more sharply drawn between Jewish leaders who are favorable to Zionism and those who hold contrary views. There are many prominent members of the race both rabbis and men of other callings who are devoted to the cause — such men for example as Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the Supreme Court, Judge Julian W. Mack and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. Some of the Zionist leaders are bitter in their denunciation of the British government for its failure to carry out the promises made the Zionists. They insist that Palestine both east and west of the Jordan should be placed under Zionist control and that at least 100,000 Jewish immigrants should be brought into the country within the next five years. A much larger number of Jews, among whom are some of the most intelligent and progressive rabbis, remain unconvinced regarding both the practicability and the desirability of the Zionist plans. They are willing to contribute generously to the benevolent funds for the care of indigent Jews in eastern Europe and Palestine, as they do for similar charities at home. They are even willing in many instances to make donations to the cause of Palestine reconstruction on the grounds of sentiment. But they are not greatly moved by the proposals of Zionism, knowing something of the difficulties, political and economic, which it must encounter. And there are great numbers of Jews particularly among the orthodox, who are wholly opposed to the project on grounds of religious conviction, or are actually unaware of the entire proposal. It needs to be added that the advocates of Zionism are making an earnest and vigorous campaign to interest their fellow religionists, and apparently not without success. Carefully directed efforts are made both through the press and by platform and synagogue addresses to arouse interest in the enterprise.

Many shades of opinion are expressed in the official gatherings of the Zionist organizations both in the United States and in Europe. Annual gatherings of the Zionist Congress have been held in Basle, Switzerland, for a score of years, in which the policies of Zionism have been discussed with great freedom, and often with wide differences of view. The resignation of Dr. Chaim Weizmann as president of the World Zionist organization and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, on October 21, 1930 was in protest against the Palestine policy of the British government, but also in criticism of extreme anti-British statements made on the floor of the congress. Dr. Weizmann maintained that Jews should do nothing to impair the friendly feeling between themselves and Great Britain. Other resignations of leading Zionists, such as the late Lord Malchett and Felix M. Warburg, from official positions in Jewish organizations have been intended as effective protests against British policies in Palestine. Nahum Sokolow, chairman of the Zionist Executive, was chosen president of the Congress in succession to Dr. Weizmann.

A heavy financial burden is carried by the Jewish Agency for Palestine, a deficit of four millions of dollars being reported at the 1931 meeting. Jews all over the world are contributing to this fund, which is the major item in the Zionist budget. It is used for educational, health and sanitation service in Palestine. In addition generous gifts have been made by individual Jews, like the late Nathan Straus, for the construction and maintenance of hospitals, dispensaries and homes which are rendering efficient service not alone to the Jewish but as well to the Arab population.

Thus far the more important aspects of Zionism have been considered. No one can fail to be impressed with the nobility of the idea, and its far-reaching implications. The mood of the western world, and perhaps even more of the orient, is turning favorably to the program of self-determination for all people. That great ideal which emerged from the anguish of the world war caught the imagination of many disinherited, expatriated and depressed peoples, and though only meagrely realized as yet in the continued effort to maintain supremacies and balances of power, it has had its undoubted effect on the world's thinking, and to this extent has favored the aspirations of the Jews for a homeland and an independent place among the nations.

Nor can Christians be unaffected by such incidents. Judaism is nearest to Christianity in the great household of religions. The basic beliefs of the two groups are the same. As time goes on and partisan views recede it is desirable and inevitable that Jews and Christians shall come into more cordial and intimate relations in the attainment of their ideals. Any series of events, therefore, which affects the Jewish people, either as a whole or in so conspicuous a part as the Zionist group, cannot be without real significance to the Christian world.

In attempting to discuss the problem of Zionism it is natural to assume an attitude favorable to the Jewish people as a whole, inclusive of the Zionists, who at the present time have attracted to themselves a large measure of interest. Whatever one's sentiments may be regarding particular features of the movement, the place of the Jew in the cultural, ethical and religious life of the world elicits approval. And whatever the Jews as a race and the rest of the onlooking public may think of Zionism, few will find themselves able to withhold their admiration in view of the heroism and gallantry which have animated the pioneers and a great company of the humbler workers in that enterprise.

In speaking particularly of the communal Zionist colonies a non-Jewish but sympathetic observer writes appreciatively of the "homeland" idea, and adds: "But in the communal colonies you feel something else as well. It is the spirit of dedication not merely to Zion, but to a better Zion; it is the contagion of an enthusiasm not merely to reclaim the land, but to restore it to ways of justice, righteousness and peace which shall fulfill the defeated dreams of the prophets who are Israael's greatest gift to humankind. The thought of the Communists far outreaches and transcends the bounds of the Zionist movement itself. They are Zionists, to be sure; but also more than Zionists. If Zionism meant nothing other than populating and planting Palestine, and adding one more to the nations of the world, they would not be interested. But what they see in Palestine today is a chance to build a new nation — to begin the age-old social experiment all over again — to avoid the mistakes that have cursed and ultimately destroyed all civilizations hitherto, and by laying deep and sure at the start the durable conditions of brotherhood and peace, establish at last the ideal society upon the earth."[15]

There are other aspects of the subject which are of equal importance, and which demand consideration in any balanced assessment of the theme. Many are of the opinion that the plan as projected by the Zionist leaders is practicable and in process of realization. Others, not so optimistic, believe that in time a small homogeneous Jewish nation may be formed within the Arabic province of Palestine, but that it will require both foreign protection and support. The problem of Palestine is still unresolved.

---

[15] John Haynes Holmes, in "Unity," Feb. 16, 1930.

XII

JEW AND ARAB IN PALESTINE

The chief problem which confronts Zionism today is not that of economic solvency, difficult as that may seem. It is that of populational adjustment. Palestine is an old and well inhabited land. Its population is not as large as the country will accommodate, but at all periods in its history, save the times of complete collapse through famine or war, it has been reasonably populous, and is today. The people represent many different strains, but they are dominantly Arabic, with a strong Jewish minority, and smaller groups of many sorts. The Arabic element is said to number somewhat more than 1,100,000 in a total population of 1,300,000. The Jews number about 170,000. The other groups are smaller.[1]

Historically the masters of the land have been successively the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, Arabs and, with two centuries of interruption by the crusaders, the Turks for the past dozen centuries until the end of the world war and the establishment of the British mandate. During the centuries of Turkish rule the population has been dominantly Arabic, with a small group of Turkish officials in control. Both Turks and Arabs are Moslems, professing the faith of the Prophet of Islam. Before the days of the crusades the military power of Islam passed from the Arabs to the Turks, and the caliphate, or "successorship" to Mohammed, was merged in the office of Turkish sultan in Constantinople (Istanbul). This has been a situation greatly deplored by the Arabs, who resented the intrusion of an alien of Mongolian race into the sacred heritage of the Prophet. The fall of the sultan raised the hopes of the many Arab states that the caliphate might be restored to a member of their race.[2]

---

[1] See page 34.

The four pillars of the law of Islam are prayer, of the five daily periods; fasting, particularly during the holy month of Ramadan; the pilgrimage to Mecca, which confers special merit; and the giving of alms to the poor. While Moslems are scattered over the entire orient, and are of many races, Arabia as the home of the Prophet is the bond of their religion, and the holy cities of Mecca and Medina as connected with his life are places of special reverence. Hardly less sacred to them is Jerusalem, as the scene of the Prophet's alleged night visit, and the spot from which he ascended to heaven. In a lesser degree Hebron is revered as connected with the life of the prophet Abraham, and the place of his burial. The Koran, the sacred book of the Moslems, makes constant reference to the holy men of the Old and New Testaments as "prophets," beginning with Adam and ending with Jesus. Mohammed alone holds a higher rank in the prophetic order.

The holy cities of Arabia are believed to be profaned by the presence of any non-Moslem, and few such have ever been able to visit them and return. In consequence the Arabs of the peninsula, and particularly of Mecca and Medina, regard themselves as belonging to a superior class, the aristocracy of Islam. Most of the population of Egypt and farther Africa is Moslem, but the Arabs of Palestine are of purer blood than those of Egypt, and their Arabic is nearer the classical tongue of the Koran. Of kindred race are the Arabs of Transjordania, Yemen, Iraq, the Hijaz, the Nejd, and a number of smaller areas which form the outlying neighborhood of Palestine. They regard themselves as belonging to a potential league of Arab states, with a common speech and a common faith.

---

[2] There are several divisions of Moslems, as there are of Christians. The chief Moslem sects are the Shiites and the Sunnites. Another classification refers to their relation to a caliph, which office is in a manner like that of the pope in the Catholic church. The Moslems who would correspond to the Catholic section of Christendom and would acknowledge the authority of a caliph would be those of Arab, of Indian and Persian type. The Protestant Moslems, less interested in a lineal successor to the Prophet, are of the Turkish group.

Furthermore, there is of late a profound awakening of Arab self-consciousness as the result of the war and the events which have taken place since. The Arab of the educated type realizes that to his race belong a history and a culture which have few equals in the story of civilization. Over all the region where once the Semitic races held sway, Arabic is the prevailing speech, spoken by Moslems, Jews and Christians alike. It is a living tongue, with all the characteristics of daily conversation, public address, journalism and books which form one of the most extensive literatures in existence. The peoples of all the near east, Syrians, Egyptians and Iraqis, as well as Palestinians and even the Samaritans of Nablous, speak the Arabic language, which comes in unbroken tradition from the times of the Prophet.[3] The Arabs once held an empire which in a few years conquered the whole of the territory lying between the Iranian plateau, the Armenian mountains and the Mediterranean Sea.

---

[3] Cf. Professor James A. Montgomery, *Arabia Today,* in the "Journal of the American Oriental Society," June, 1927, pp. 97–132.

Arab teachers transmitted to the unawakened world of Europe the knowledge of the ancient classics of Greece and Rome. Arabic was the Latin of all western Asia. Arab scholars studied Aristotle, Archimedes and Galen in the schools of Baghdad and Cairo and, with the assistance of learned Jews, handed on this culture to the Moorish universities of Spain; for, as already pointed out,[4] Arabs and Jews were the enlighteners of Europe in the Dark Ages. Mathematics came to new values in Arabic hands. The nine numerals were the Arabic adaptation of mathematical signs originating in India, and relieved the world of the incubus of the Roman notation.[5] Al-Geber devised the mathematical science which bears his name. Arab astronomers invented instruments and calculated the orbits of stars six centuries before the science became known in Europe. The Arabic culture of the court of Haroun ar-Rashid at Baghdad far surpassed that of his contemporary Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle. An Arabic proverb declared that " the ink of the learned is as precious as the blood of the martyrs."

When the Mongols under Genghis Khan and Tamerlane swept down from their arid plateaus on this world of Arabic culture they destroyed its structure, but they yielded to its spell. The wild tribes from Turkestan took over the speech, the civilization and the religion of the conquered people. The Turks became Moslems and adopted the Arabic language and customs. The court of the Mongol khan of

---

[4] See page 294.

[5] How did the Roman mathematicians work problems in cube root or calculus with the cumbersome system of Roman numerals?

Persia was as brilliant as that of Cairo, and far surpassed that of papal Rome in art and literature. The retinue of Saladin in Damascus was a marvel to those who came from the west. The Turks in two centuries adopted the arts and refinements of the Arabs, and in comparison with the Greeks of Constantinople or the Moslems of Syria most of the crusaders appeared barbarous and brutal.

It is in the light of this brilliant past that the Moslems, both Arab and Turk, view the present question of the possession of Palestine. The Turk has been given his dismissal from the land and its neighboring regions, and has withdrawn his capital from Istanbul to Ankara (Angora). But under the masterful leadership of Mustapha Kemal Pasha he has turned his face westward, has adopted the Latin alphabet, has separated church and state, church and school, church and law, has abolished the dervish superstition, has closed the mediaeval Moslem schools, has made polygamy illegal, has banished the fez for men and the veil for women and is building a modern state on European and American models.

Equally ambitious is the modern, progressive Arab. He is both conscious and proud of the story of his race. The squalor and poverty, the ignorance and filth found in so many of the Moslem villages of Palestine are evident enough, as such conditions are wherever the Turk held sway. The same conditions were to be found in many of the Jewish quarters under the old régime and are even yet. Jews and Arabs alike were the victims of a vicious and tyrannical government, and the Arabs were as unhappy and resentful as the Jews. Now both races have a new vision of opportunity, and each is eager to make the most of the occasion. Poor as is Palestine in natural resources, it is more fruitful than the desert from which most of its people, ancient and modern, have come. It is the garden spot of the great Arabian parallelogram which stretches north-west and south-east from the fertile crescent to the Indian Ocean and from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf. The Arab peasant of Palestine, with his primitive plow and sickle, his ox and camel yoked unequally together, does not impress the beholder with the idea of thrift and competence. And many of the Moslem homes and the dark underground school rooms are depressing.

But a new spirit is astir in the land. Improved governmental conditions under the British mandate, the spur of emulation of the more progressive and thrifty Jewish colonies, and the aspirations resulting from the consciousness of larger liberty and expanding power have given the Arab population of Palestine a new sense of its dignity and possibilities. For this new spirit no little credit is due the Zionists, and their coming has been a blessing to the entire population. With the marked releases of opportunity and energy possible under the new mandate régime, almost any population would awaken to life and hope. But the Zionists by their initiative and even more by their funds have opened a new era in the history of the land. That they regard this as providential, the answer of God to the prayers of generations of their people, and the open path to the achievement of their historic mission is both natural and opportune. The redemption of Palestine from the hands of such a race as the Turks was a consummation devoutly to be wished. The alert and ambitious type of Jew has set an example of industry and competence which has not been lost on the more lethargic Arab; and the claims made by the more confident and even arrogant Zionists have aroused the Moslem population to alarm and resentment. Zionism has shattered the old, easy-going, tolerant and friendly sentiment between Jews and Arabs, and has set both peoples on edge with a sense of new opportunity and perhaps of impending trouble.

Of this rising apprehension and hostility the Wailing Wall and the Balfour declaration are the symbols and occasions. The Wailing Wall[6] is an exposed portion of the Herodian wall of Jerusalem on the west side of the Haram es-Sharif (the Noble, or August Sanctuary), built on Mt. Zion,[7] or Moriah, and formerly the site of the temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel and Herod. The Haram is crowned with two large and several small edifices. The most important is the lovely Kubbat es-Sakhra, or Dome of the Rock, often miscalled the Mosque of Omar. This building is particularly sacred, as it covers the rock where traditionally Abraham offered his sacrifice, where the altar of burnt offerings stood, and from which it is alleged the prophet Mohammed ascended to heaven. The wall surrounding the Haram contains some remnants of Graeco-Roman Jerusalem. The south-western part of the wall, containing these lower courses of old masonry, is exposed for some distance and reveals a number of large stones which have acquired the reputation of having belonged to the temple of Solomon. This is not the case. There are no remnants of the temple of Solomon anywhere yet discovered. These stones belong to the courses of masonry included in the temple built by Herod to conciliate the Jewish people. Most of the wall is Moslem, and has been for hundreds of years.

---

[6] Cf. Vincent Sheean, *The Stone Symbol of Jewish Dreams,* "Asia," January, 1930, pp. 31–37.

[7] Tradition since the time of the empress Helena has given the name of Zion to the upper or Herodian city. But the biblical data make it clear that Zion and Moriah were the same, the eastern hill, on which the successive temples were erected; see p. 326.

This spot was selected sometime in the past by the Jews in Jerusalem as their place of worship and lamentation. How long it has been thus held sacred by them is not known, but probably for some centuries. By some it is claimed that the custom is as old as the sixth century. It is not certain that this particular spot has been the only one so venerated. Another section of the wall further north bears late Hebrew inscriptions which suggest that it may once have been used as a place of Jewish service. The privilege of using this spot for worship was suspended for a time during the last century, but the renewal of the privilege was obtained from the sultan by Sir Moses Montefiore.

Any inspection of the place will show that it is an unfortunate choice, for Moslem tradition affirms that it is the location of the underground mosque of El-Buraq, the Prophet's horse, which was tethered there by the archangel Gabriel. The wall is part of the sacred Islamic wall and the entire plot is the inviolable Waqf (an entailed, inalienable space) of Abu Madian, an Arab saint of at least five hundred years standing. The Zionists claim that this is a late Moslem tradition, devised to invalidate the rights of Jews to access to the spot. This has not been substantiated.

The service which is held at the Wailing Wall on Friday evenings, the beginning of the Sabbath, is informal in character, consisting of readings from the book of prayers, a responsive service chiefly taken from the book of Lamentations, a threnody over the fall of the city. The service is usually conducted by a rabbi, and the responses are given by the circle about him. There may be several of these circles in the small area along the wall. The term " wailing " is something of a misnomer, although genuine grief is often manifested by participants in the service. It is the tradition that the Jews of Jerusalem who receive the " haluka," the portion or dole given to pensioners, are obligated to maintain the services at the Wailing Wall in behalf of Jews throughout the world.

The question of Jewish rights at this spot is not one of recent origin. As long ago as 1840 the Jews made an effort to secure possession of the wall by putting in a pavement in front of it. In reference to this request the governor of Palestine, Mohammed Sharif, the official representative of Ibrahim Pasha, son of Mehemit Ali of Cairo, wrote Seyyed Ahmed Agha Duzdar, Governor-General of Jerusalem, that because of the fact that " the place to which the Jewish petitioners have made reference, with a view to paving it, is adjoining the wall of Haram es-Sharif and also to the tethering place of El-Buraq, and in addition to this is within the Waqf property of His Saintliness Abu Madian . . . and whereas it is found that such a request by the Jews is not permitted by Es-Sharia (the sacred law of Islam), therefore the Jews cannot be allowed to make this pavement." Various other restrictions are added, limiting the right of access to " visits in accordance with the ancient custom."

Apparently the Jews did not take very seriously the Moslem claim to the sanctity of the place, or else they believed it possible to secure by gradual steps a certain property right in the Wailing Wall. At least the official ruling was repeated several times after the European powers restored Palestine to Turkey in 1841. The most explicit warning was given in 1912, when the Jews undertook to introduce at the wall the appurtenances of a synagogue, including chairs, table and other articles. This called forth a resolution of the Administrative Council, which after reciting the causes of the action proceeded:—"the said road, lying among the Waqf buildings adjoining the Wall of the glorious Mosque of El-Aksa to the west, is a private road without an outlet; and in addition to this, the said road is one of those belonging to the Waqf. Therefore it is not allowed by Es-Sharia under any circumstances that anything be placed there, or any innovation brought in, whether it be tools or instruments like chairs, screens or any other thing."[8]

One may easily share the feeling of most Zionists that there is much pretence and sophistry in connection with the Moslem claims regarding the Waqf of Abu Madian and its inviolability. Yet no one who understands the Arab character and his reverence for shrines supposed in any manner to be associated with the career of the Prophet can doubt the hold which this tradition has upon the Moslem mind. And since the official record appears clearly to be on their side, they evidently propose to make the most of it. That the property rights of the place lie with the Moslems and are so recognized by the Zionists is shown by the fact that in 1919 an effort was made by the latter to purchase the site. The offer was made by Ronald Storrs, and the price offered was $400,000. This was of course refused.[9] But steady encroachments were made from time to time. On the Jewish Day of Atonement in September 1928 what seemed like a deliberate effort to create an open synagogue was made by the Jews, who brought many of the appurtenances of a place of worship, of which a screen to separate the men from the women was the most conspicuous and offensive. This threatened serious trouble, and the screen was removed by the Deputy District Commissioner, at which action the Zionists were deeply offended. In consequence of this episode the British government issued a White Paper in November recounting the events of the Day of Atonement, and stating that the Wailing Wall is Moslem property, which the Jews however have the right to visit, but only with such accessories of worship (the Arabs say books of prayer, the Jews say chairs) as they were allowed under Turkish rule. This was the situation at the time of the outbreak on August 23, 1929.

---

[8] Quoted by Sheean (*loc. cit.*, p. 37) from the official record of the Wailing Wall in the archives of the Waqf Department of the Palestine Government.

In order the better to understand this tragic event it is well to have in mind the political situation which forms its background. Palestine, as already stated, is occupied by approximately a million Arabs whose official head is the Grand Mufti, Haj Amin al-Husseini, Rais al-Ulema (President of the supreme Moslem religious court), with complete authority over Moslem schools, charities, mosques, clergy and courts. Immediately to the east across the Jordan lies the district called Transjordania, which is approximately the area which in Roman days was the province of Arabia. The great peninsula which now bears that name is occupied by a number of additional Arab states, such as Syria, the Hijaz, Iraq, the Nejd, Hasa, Yemen, Aden, Asir, Oman, Kuweit, Kerek, Bahrein, Bab al-Mandeb, Hadramaut, etc., to the number of twenty-five, conscious of their racial, linguistic and religious unity, and eager, now that the caliphate has ceased to be a Turkish perquisite, to form a Pan-Islamic league and choose an Arabic successor to the Prophet.

---

[9] Cf. Sheean, *loc. cit.*, p. 61.

These states have an Arabic population of nine or ten millions. Closely affiliated with them are the Moslems of Egypt, central Africa, India and other lands as far distant as China. Notable leaders have risen among these Arabs in recent years. The most conspicuous of them was Sherif Husein of Mecca, a descendant of the Prophet and king of Hijaz, who proclaimed himself caliph, and for a time was the outstanding figure in the Arabic world. He had four sons: Ali, who succeeded him as king of Hijaz, Feisal now king of Iraq, Abdullah later emir of Transjordania, and Emir Zeid. An energetic and powerful figure is Ibn Saud, king of the Nejd, perhaps the greatest of all Arabs today, and believed by most informed observers to be destined to a notable career as an Arab leader.

With the approach of the world war the chief concern of the British government was the safety of the Suez Canal, the jugular vein of the empire, its essential means of communication with India. With the Turks in control of Palestine and allied with the Central Powers, the danger of this area was acute, as was shown by an alarming although unsuccessful attack on the Canal in February 1915. Manifestly the most promising plan of defense lay in securing the aid of the Arab tribes of Sinai and the Transjordan region, who, although Moslems like the Turks, were not inclined to respond to the Turkish call to a " jihad " or Moslem holy war against the Allies. The dream of a Pan-Arabic empire and the restoration of the caliphate to its Meccan inheritance had long been cherished by Syrian and other Arabs.[10] Conferences between Husein and the British officials in Egypt began in 1914 and were made more urgent by the German-Turkish attack in the following winter.

In July, 1915 Sir Henry MacMahon, British High Commissioner for Egypt, completed a definite agreement with Husein in behalf of the Arab tribes for their entrance into the combination of the allied forces. The stipulation included the plan of an Arab government, which with certain specific exceptions, like the British rights at Aden, Basrah and in northern Syria, should extend " to the Taurus on the north, including Cilicia, and embrace the whole extent of land between the Mediterranean and the Persian highlands." That this included Palestine was never questioned. The documents have not been published, but have been examined by interested scholars who have gone through the files furnished from the library of King Feisal at Baghdad. The Arabs understood that the promise was confirmed by the proclamation of General Maude in Baghdad, March 19, 1917. Members of the British government have denied that the agreement necessarily included Palestine, yet it would be difficult to explain the exclusion of the most important portion of the stipulated area in a contract so vital to Arab hopes and to British security.

---

[10] Montgomery, *loc. cit.*, p. 103.

On the basis of the agreement thus made Husein and his Arabs made a beginning at the fulfillment of his part of the contract, but with only indifferent results. Then it was that Thomas E. Lawrence, that taciturn and mysterious adventurer, one of the most remarkable characters in the war, speaking Arabic like a native, who had been in close contact with the Arabs of the Hijaz and Sinai since the autumn of 1916, organized the camel corps of the desert, took Husein's son Feisal as the most promising leader for the Arabs, and by putting the Hijaz railroad out of commission as far north as Amman, materially assisted Lord Allenby's campaign in 1917, which culminated in the surrender of Jerusalem December 9, and the victorious battle of Mt. Ephraim in the following September.

In the meantime, while the Arab leaders were counting on the fulfillment of the promises made them, and Husein was actually proclaiming himself caliph, the British and French governments entered into a compact known as the Sykes-Picot Agreement (May 16, 1916) which was not published until after the war. By this pact the territory north of Arabia was divided into two zones of control, the French taking the northern and the British the southern, Palestine being reserved for " an international administration " whose form was to be decided by the Allies " and the representatives of the Sherif of Mecca " (Husein). Within that territory " France and Great Britain are disposed to recognize an independent Arab state or Confederation of Arab States." [11]

---

[11] Montgomery, *loc. cit.*, p. 104.

This was the ambiguous situation when on November 2, 1917 the Balfour declaration was issued,[12] virtually promising Palestine to the Jewish people as a "homeland," with the understanding, however, that the plan was not to interfere in any manner with the rights of non-Jewish people in Palestine, nor with Jewish enterprises in any other region. To the charge that this declaration ignored the promises made the Arabs the answer was that it took precedence of all other British agreements.

In December 1918 France and Great Britain finally agreed that the latter should administer Palestine, notwithstanding the earlier arrangement. When the mandates system was established at the Peace Conference it was also declared that certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish empire should be provisionally recognized as independent nations subject to administrative advice of a mandatory power until they were able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities were to be important factors in selecting the mandatories. But the Supreme Allied Council awarded the mandate for Syria and Lebanon to France and for Palestine and Iraq to Great Britain, without reference to the opinions of the natives. The terms of the Palestine mandate declared that the mandatory should put the country under administrative, political and economic conditions which would secure the establishment of the Jewish national home; should develop self-governing institutions and safeguard the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine; should facilitate Jewish immigration and encourage the close settlement of Jews on the land, including state land and waste land, with the aid of the official Jewish agency and without prejudicing the rights of other sections of the population; should assume responsibility for holy places and religious sites without interfering with purely Moslem shrines, etc.[13]

---

[12] See page 64.

The mandate for Palestine thus given to Great Britain by the Treaty of Sèvres in 1919 was confirmed by the League Council at San Remo, April 24, 1920, and by the League of Nations July 24, 1922, "putting into effect the declaration originally made on November 2, 1917 by the government of his Britannic Majesty and adopted by the said powers (the principal allied powers) in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.[14] This merely repeats the language of the Balfour declaration.

In 1920 the British military administration in Palestine, which had been in control since the surrender of Jerusalem in 1917, was replaced by the civil form of government, and Sir Herbert Samuel was appointed High Commissioner of Palestine and Transjordania, under the direction of the Foreign Office in London. It was his difficult task to satisfy as far as possible the Arab demands, to modify as well as he could the extravagance of the more radical Zionist claims, and to maintain a measure of order among an excited and irritated people. This was not an easy achievement. Riots broke out in 1920 in various parts of the country. These were repeated in 1921. There was vigorous propaganda on both sides. Among the causes of disturbance were the Arab lands sold to Jews, the acquisition of important commercial rights by Zionists, the charge that political demonstrations were made by Jews in Tel-Aviv against Arabs, outbreaks in various parts of the country in which Arabs attacked Jewish settlements, absurd rumors that were spread after the Tel-Aviv demonstration to the effect that Jews had "killed all the Moslems in Jaffa" and were about to attack the Mosque of Omar in Jerusalem. Most of these reports were quite without foundation, or were based on just enough fact to inflame ignorant and suspicious people.

---

[13] "Information Service," Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, *The Palestine Conflict*, Nov. 23, 1929.

[14] Quoted verbatim from the Mandate for Palestine.

A commission was appointed at that time to investigate the various phases of the situation. The report attempted to place the blame for the troubles impartially upon the two parties. A general amnesty was granted by the High Commissioner from which the Grand Mufti, the head of the Arab community in Palestine, was alone excluded on the ground that he had instigated the Jerusalem riots of the year before. He was however pardoned on a special petition later. The commission of that time did its best to steer a middle course between the claims of the racial groups concerned. Neither party was satisfied, which was not strange. The Balfour declaration had precipitated a seemingly impossible situation. It had the appearance of an attempt by a highly placed official of the British empire, insufficiently acquainted with previous commitments of his government and with actual conditions in Palestine, to establish a national home for one race in a land which was already the national home of another race.

The Arab leader Feisal, who had received the promise that an Arab nation was to be approved by the Allies, attended the Versailles Conference to plead his cause. He received no satisfaction and returned to Damascus in December 1919, and was as a benevolent gesture proclaimed king of Syria on March 11, 1920, Palestine being definitely included in his territory. But the very next month the mandate for Syria was conferred on France by the League Council, and Feisal who declined to abdicate was defeated by the French at Meisalum near Damascus in July, and compelled to leave the country. He was later given the title of king of Iraq, under the British mandate for that area, with his capital at Baghdad (August 1921). That brief period of Feisal's phantom "kingship of Syria," with a territory defined as extending from Mount Sinai to the Taurus, and from the desert to the sea (thus including Palestine) was as near as the Arabs ever came to the realization of their hopes for the fulfillment of the British and allied promises.[15] Another quieting potion was administered to the family of the Sherif Husein when his third son, Abdullah, was given the complimentary position of emir of Transjordania, under the British High Commissioner (February 1921). His residence is at Amman, the capital of the district, and he has as his "adviser" a British official. It is understood that he receives a subsidy of £28,000 from the British government.

From the date of the Balfour declaration there has been constant inter-racial disturbance in Palestine. Neither the

---

[15] Montgomery, *loc. cit.*, pp. 106, 107.

Zionists nor the Arabs were satisfied with the situation. And neither party as a group has been responsible for the troubles that have arisen. The background of rival claims to Palestine accounts in large measure for the bitterness exhibited in the episodes that have transpired. For the most part the two races have lived together both in Jerusalem and elsewhere in the land in comparative friendliness. But the Arabs have been deeply stirred by the growing suspicion that the promises made them were to be ignored and the land handed over to the Jews. Particularly were the tribes across the Jordan excited by the trend of events, and organized themselves for raids and reprisals. The Jews are a peaceful people but, relying on the declaration of Lord Balfour, they felt themselves within their rights in defending themselves as well as they could, and looked to Great Britain as the police power to protect them. There have been instances in which individual Jews have been at fault by reason of their insistent, deliberate and provocative assertion of rights. Both Jews and Arabs are excitable, and both have definite, assertive, and not always well-founded views regarding their respective claims to the land. The Palestine government is called upon in the meantime to administer law and justice under impossible conditions arising from contradictory commitments. It is not strange that there has been constant friction. It is not easy to see how even more tragic incidents are to be avoided in the future unless Zionists and Arabs discover a friendly attitude toward each other. That Lord Balfour, however ignorant he may have been of real conditions in the near east, was in some measure learning the lesson of the tactical error of the declaration that goes by his name is suggested by his words uttered at a mass meeting in the Albert Hall, July 12, 1920, expressing the hope that the Arabs may not "grudge that small niche in what are now Arab territories being given to the people who for all these hundreds of years have been separated from it."[16]

In 1922 the British Colonial office issued a White Paper giving a statement of British policy in Palestine, declaring that "the terms of the (Balfour) Declaration . . . do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home, but that such a home should be founded in Palestine. . . . When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish national home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community . . . in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. . . . For the fulfillment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers by immigration."

Neither the Zionists nor the Arabs were satisfied with conditions nor with the attempts of the British administration to interpret its equivocal attitude. There were repeated outbreaks. The problem of creating self-governing institutions was the cause of much conflict. From 1920 to 1922 there was no legislature. A nominated Advisory Council of ten British officials, four Moslem Arabs, three Christian Arabs and two Jews aided the administration. In 1922 the High Commissioner tried to introduce a constitution provid-

[16] Cf. *The Great Betrayal,* by Stephen S. Wise and Jacob de Haas, p. 46.

ing for a legislative council of ten official members, eight Moslems, two Christians and two Jews. The Palestine Zionist Executive approved of the proposal. The Executive of the Palestine Arab Congress opposed it because the draft constitution was based on the Balfour declaration which they disapproved as prejudicial to their interests and to Palestinian national hopes and contrary to the League and the Hague covenants; also because the Arabs feared that the official members might combine with the Jews against the Arabs; and finally because they considered that the High Commissioner's powers would be excessive.

The proposed constitution was abandoned because the Arabs boycotted the elections. The Advisory Council could not be restored because the nationalists forced the resignation of the Arabs appointed to it. In 1923, the Arabs rejected proposals for an Arab agency corresponding to the Jewish agency. Since then the government of Palestine has been carried on directly by the British administration. The sentiment of non-Jews in Palestine was illustrated when in 1925 Lord Balfour visited Jerusalem to open officially the University. On that occasion every non-Jewish shop in the city was closed in protest against his presence. There was no rioting, but the situation was very tense. On every anniversary of the Balfour declaration there has been a Jewish celebration and a hostile Arab demonstration and protest strike until 1930.

As a result of the Balfour declaration there was an immediate movement of Jews to Palestine. From 1922 to 1928 the population increased rapidly. Most of the immigrants settled in the towns. They have bought all land privately at high rates from Arab owners. In 1927, there were 104 Jewish agricultural settlements, of which 50 were Zionist colonies. Jews hold about a quarter of a million acres of land of which only 37.2 per cent is under actual cultivation. Overhead expenses in many of the settlements are high. Only eight of the Zionist agricultural settlements were self-supporting in 1929. Zionists complain that the agricultural population paid too large a share of the taxes and that the government did not make a proportionate return in subsidies for education and public health work, though the subsidy for education has been increased to "approximately the full share due" for Jewish education. In both health and education the government's policy has been to spend as large a proportion as possible on the more needy Arab majority. Jews have complained of the lack of protection for Jews in view of Arab hostility.

All these events and conditions led logically and perhaps inevitably to the Wailing Wall episode of August 23, 1929. It will be remembered that on September 24, 1928 during the services for the Day of Atonement the police forcibly removed a temporary screen erected to separate the sexes. The British administration is responsible for "preserving existing rights" at the holy places. Jews were further aroused by the fact that Moslems were allowed to erect a building within the enclosure beyond the Wailing Wall and to cut a doorway in another section of the wall. The Wailing Wall question had become both a political and a religious issue. The two great Jewish and Moslem celebrations fell on August 15 and 16 in that year so that great numbers of Jews and Moslems were in Jerusalem at the same time. Rioting occurred at the

Wailing Wall in which Jews were killed and there were attacks on the Jews throughout the country in which blood was shed at Hebron, Safed, and elsewhere. Naturally the fighting was not all on one side. The Jews defended themselves as well as they could. In some cases they were the aggressors. There was a small demonstration by young " radicals " from Tel-Aviv coming to Jerusalem. Then the silly rumor spread among all the Arab settlements that the Jews had marched on the Mosque of Omar and that the streets of Jaffa were running in Moslem blood. It was a totally tragic and unnecessary series of incidents. The fact that companies of Arabs from across the Jordan were in the city heightened the confusion and increased the tension.

A commission was appointed in January to investigate the event, with Sir Walter Shaw as chairman. The commission consisted of four Englishmen, appointed by the foreign office in London, with full recognition of the difficult task ahead, and the necessity of choosing men of diplomatic experience and acknowledged impartiality. They sat for many days during January in Jerusalem. Before them appeared people of every sort who had been summoned or who felt themselves competent to give evidence bearing on the matters involved. Practically every phase of the Zionist-Arab embroglio was brought out: the causes and incidents of the riots of August, the number of people injured and of which race, the nature of the promises made to the Jews and the Arabs respectively, the nature and history of Jewish claim to possession and privilege at the Wailing Wall, the Moslem insistence on their possession of this spot, the question whether the Jews made good farmers, the grounds of Jewish claims to have reduced malaria, whether the Arab peasants are being left sufficient lands for cultivation, the nature of the commercial rights secured by the Zionists, and many other questions related to the situation.

The commission made its report at the end of March. It declared that the outbreak in Jerusalem was " from beginning to end an attack by the Arabs on the Jews, for which no excuse in the form of earlier murders by the Jews has been established." On the other hand it added, " It is our belief that the feeling of resentment among Palestine Arabs, consequent upon their disappointment at their continued failure to obtain any measure of self-government, greatly aggravated the difficulties of the local administration." And further that the special position, assigned to the Zionist body by the mandate, does not entitle it to share in any degree in the government of Palestine.

As might have been anticipated, that report was satisfactory neither to Jews nor Arabs. The Zionist organs were bitter in their denunciation of the report as " a concession to criminality," and the Arabs found in it a leaning to Jewish interests quite inconsistent with the pledges made to their people by Great Britain in the days when British interests at the canal demanded Arab assistance in meeting the German-Turkish advance. Could the Shaw commission come nearer to a satisfactory solution of the problem? Not with the background of a mistaken British policy and of contradictory assurances given to the two races.

It is this equivocal position in which the British government stands in regard to Palestine which is the source of constant unrest and friction in the country, and will continue to encourage the population, in spite of all British police force, to periodic outbreaks of racial violence. The suggestion of the commission that the government " clarify its stand in the Balfour declaration " provided an embarrassing item in the report. For it is exactly that attempt to " clarify " the attitude of any government, labor, conservative or liberal, toward the administration of Palestine affairs which will cause an outburst of anger on the part of the unfavored group, and lead to further trouble. It is rather the part of diplomacy to avoid any decision, and let matters worry along in their vague and confused plight, passing on the responsibility of action to future commissions and cabinets.

In September 1930 the mandates commission of the League of Nations issued from Geneva a report which dealt in part with the Palestine troubles, insisting that the Arab uprising was not primarily an attack upon the Jews, but " a movement of resistance to the policy of the manditory power; that it has failed to carry out the terms of the Mandate, the establishment of a Jewish national home, and the safeguarding of Arab interests by the development of self-governing institutions." It is not difficult to perceive the embarrassment in which the British government is placed. While neither Zionists nor Arabs can claim that the pledges made them had the authority of Parliament behind them, both insist, and rightly insist, that the promises were official and binding. Committed thus alike to the Zionists, who have gone forward with great courage and sacrifice to take advantage of the situation, and to the Arabs, who have waited with growing impatience for the downfall of the Turkish intruders and the realization of their racial hopes, the British administration, varying in its sentiments from one cabinet to the next, is confronted with one of the most sensitive and perplexing problems encountered by any nation in modern times.

It is not willing to retract the Balfour declaration, on the ground both of political consistency and of a large body of public opinion favorable to the Jews and their aspirations; on the other hand it has no desire to increase the resentment of that immense Arab population, whose good will is important in the safeguarding of the canal and in preserving friendly relations with the seventy millions of Moslems in India. On the side of the Arabs lie the preponderant considerations of numbers, restless ambition, fighting ability and religious fanaticism. No careful observer of near east affairs can doubt that the attitude of British officialism is much more favorable to the Moslem population of Palestine and the neighboring states than to the Jews. For this there are several reasons, but the chief is always the welfare and the future of the empire. This attitude is recognized by the Zionist leaders, and is the cause of much uneasiness. Nor is there any means of justifying it by argument. It is simply to be reckoned with. If compelled to choose between these opposing interests, it is not too much to say that the official view both in England and Palestine would favor the placation of Arab irritation and the relegation of Jewish interests to the background. From the British point of view the most important question is the control of the most direct lines of communication with India, although matters of prestige and economic advantage also have weight. British statesmen are wise and experienced enough to avoid siding with either the Zionists or the Arabs openly. But they will find means, as they always have in such emergencies, of delaying decisions and allowing events to take their own course. Does this not really mean siding with the Arabs, who can afford to wait, as the Zionists cannot, for the realization of their objectives?

It was a part of the recommendation of the Shaw commission that the government of Great Britain clarify its interpretation of the Balfour declaration and its contemplated policy regarding Palestine, and this was the promise of Premier MacDonald made on April 3. Accordingly on October 20, 1930 the colonial office issued its report, made by Sir John Hope Simpson, together with a White Paper setting forth the future policy of the government regarding that country, and authorized by Lord Passfield (Sydney Webb), secretary for the colonies. It set forth the disadvantages under which the Arab peasants were living both as to land and labor conditions, praised the Zionist organization for certain features of its work and criticized others, and proposed a new form of governmental machinery to give larger scope for the principle of self-determination in the case of the different racial groups. Among the chief items were the necessity of limiting strictly the immigration of Jews until such time as capacity of the country to absorb them was demonstrated. The document was long and detailed. It is worthy of careful study for its wealth of fact and its balance of judgment. It is an able statement made in the face of great difficulties and a tense situation.

The reception it met on the part of Zionists in Palestine, England and the United States was most hostile. The Jewish National Council in Jerusalem voted unanimously to reject the statement of policy and to refuse participation in the proposed legislative council.[17] Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the International Zionist movement, resigned in protest, as did Lord Malchett. The American Jewish Congress on October 20 denounced it as a repudiation of the solemn pledge given by the British government to the Jewish people. Felix M. Warburg, chairman of the administrative committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, resigned from that office. In the Zionist press the document was referred to as "the execrable White Paper." In British Parliamentary circles tory leaders, like Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Chamberlain, denounced the government for what they termed its anti-Jewish attitude. This was regarded by many, however, as a political effort to embarrass the Labor cabinet.[18]

Conscious that the official statement and the White Paper of October 20 had deeply stirred Zionists circles, Premier MacDonald, on February 13, 1931, issued a pronouncement in a letter to Dr. Chaim Weizmann disclaiming any injurious allegations on the part of the government against the

---

[17] The Arab executive committee in Jerusalem on November 2 voted to adopt a favorable attitude toward the British Palestine policy, although the Grand Mufti vigorously opposed the action.

[18] On the other hand the eminent conservative, Lord Islington, said, "The Moslem world is at least as important to Great Britain as American Jewry." He described the Zionist home as a dangerous and expensive failure. He said that it is impossible to create a Jewish home in a country where for centuries 85 per cent of the population are Arabs holding tenaciously to their religion. The Daily Mail commended the government for its one sensible act in recent months, and added: "The Balfour declaration was only one of many contradictory promises given by the Allies during the war. In 1915 they promised the Arabs a government of their own; in 1917 came the Balfour declaration, made casually without consulting parliament or the nation; in 1918 there was to be a self-governing Arab state under British supervision. Millions of British money have been spent to uphold the Balfour declaration, only resulting in world-wide damage to British prestige."

Jewish people, and affirming an early purpose to ascertain what state and other lands were available for settlement by the Jews, and its obligation to facilitate Jewish immigration according to the absorptive capacity of the country, and to encourage settlement of Jews on land; a promise, he said, which must be fulfilled without prejudice to the rights and position of other sections of the population. Other statements were made and the document as a whole was regarded as making concessions to the Jews beyond the limits of the White Paper. Dr. Weizmann expressed his satisfaction with it. Yet this declaration did not commit the government to the conversion of Palestine into a Jewish state of the type desired by the extreme Zionists. And it was certain to arouse fresh Arab protests. It was no surprise therefore to learn that within a month the Arab executive in Jerusalem had declared a boycott on the Jews in Palestine. Further a formal protest was issued by them in April citing a long list of grievances, and demanding to be given self-government according to the population without fear or favor; to be given an equal chance with the other inhabitants to develop the country; to be able to maintain all their land rights as under the old system; that their religious rights be not interfered with; and that there should be no Zionist domination in their own country.

On June 8 a commission appointed in the previous year, under the direction of the League of Nations to determine the status of the Wailing Wall, reported that the sole ownership of the wall and the pavement in front of it lay with the Moslems, but that the Jews might have free access to the wall for devotions at all times subject to certain stipulations regarding the use of appurtenances of worship, most of which are allowed only on special occasions. The secretary of the Palestine Arab Executive board and Chief Rabbi Sonnenfeld expressed their approval of the decision. The Grand Mufti, however, insisted that it was unfair to the Moslems as denying them the unfettered privileges to which they had hitherto been entitled. It would seem that in this verdict of the commission there should be a basis of settlement for at least one of the outstanding points of friction between the two racial groups.

Other recent events in the near east have been of interest to those concerned in Palestine problems. There had been open feud between Feisal, king of Iraq, and Ibn Saud, the powerful ruler of the Hijaz and the Nejd. This had continued since 1924 when Husein, then ruler of the Hijaz and father of Feisal and Abdullah, proclaimed himself caliph of all Islam. Ibn Saud at that time declared open revolt, and in two years drove the Husein family out of Arabia. Through the good offices of Sir Francis Humphrey, British High Commissioner of Iraq, Feisal and Ibn Saud met on a British war ship in the Persian Gulf and came to amicable terms. This left the two sons of Husein undisturbed in their provinces, Feisal in Iraq and Abdullah in Transjordania, and gave Ibn Saud leisure to pursue his plans for the consolidation of the various Arab states. His immediate step in that direction was the effort to control the Hijaz railroad, the pilgrim route to Mecca. This he regards as a religious trust, as it was built with contributions from Moslems in all lands. In 1921 he received an annual subsidy from the British government of £100,000. This is presumably continued. In

May 1930 the United States extended full recognition to his dual kingdom of Hijaz and Nejd together with their dependencies in the Arabian peninsula. This includes a territory of 700,000 square miles, with a population of five millions.

Mecca is the capital, as it is the sacred city of the Moslem world. But of late a decided movement has been launched to transfer the center of Islam from Mecca to Jerusalem, as more accessible and almost equally sacred to Moslems. With this end in view a Moslem university is to be established there, for which large contributions have been made by the various states of Islam. In these plans Ibn Saud is deeply concerned. His ambitious projects can hardly fail to extend to Palestine, with what results it remains to be seen. This might lead to his own ultimate election to the caliphate. Failing in this, either of the two sons of Husein might be his candidate, as they are closely connected with the Prophet's line. King Husein, their father, died in exile in Cyprus in 1930. Two of his sons, Ali and Zeid were with him. Feisal and Abdullah attempted in vain to reach his bedside by airplane. There are other aspirants to the caliphate, among them the former caliph and sultan of Turkey, Abdul Mejid, now in retirement on the Riviera; Mustapha Kemal Pasha, president of Turkey, who holds the relics of the Prophet; and the former khedive of Egypt, perhaps the wealthiest of Moslems. The all-Islam Congress, which last met in Mecca in 1926, will be the body to decide the question of the caliphate. The claim of Abdul Mejid was strengthened in November 1931 by the marriage of his daughter to the eldest son of the powerful Nizam of Hyderabad, and of his niece, the granddaughter of the late Sultan Murad V to the younger son of the Nizam.

At the conclusion of the five year period of the High Commissionership of Palestine and Transjordania in 1925, Sir Herbert Samuel was succeeded in that office by Field Marshall Lord Plumer. The third official in this succession was Lieutenant Colonel Sir John Chancellor, and on July 13, 1931 Lieutenant General A. E. Wauchope was appointed to the place. With the office of High Commissioner goes also that of Commander-in-Chief. The Deputy District Commissioner, Mr. E. Keith-Roach, is virtually the chief official in Jerusalem, although there is a nominal mayor.

From what has been said it is evident that the problem of Palestine's future is many-sided and perplexing. There are Zionists of the radical type in Palestine and elsewhere who regard the land as theirs by inheritance; who look with disdain on the Arab population, and speak of them as "red Indians" who are not to be considered in the carrying out of the Balfour declaration, who use constantly the term *Eretz Israel* (the land of Israel) in speaking of Palestine, unconscious of, or indifferent to, its fallacy and its deeply irritating effect; and who talk loosely of being "able to buy any Arab in the land." In reality whole sections of London, Berlin, Vienna, New York, Chicago and other cities are far more truly *Eretz Israel* than Palestine is or ever can be.

The chief complaint of this class of Jews is with the British government that it does not fulfill its promise to provide the Jews a "homeland in Palestine," and that it has not afforded adequate protection to the Jews in the times of Arab assaults. It must be kept in mind that no police force which the British government could provide would be adequate to pacify an aroused and fanatical Arab population in all the neighboring lands, particularly when fired by loose propaganda and malicious rumors. Some of the more ardent Zionists go so far as to insist that there should be two thousand additional Jewish immigrants admitted within five years, and they are outraged that thus far permits for only 1200 have been secured. Nor are these Zionists of the radical sort necessarily adherents of Judaism either orthodox or liberal. Very many of them are out-and-out infidels. Their interest in Zionism is political rather than religious.

On the other hand there are among the Arabs equally radical views in regard to the Zionists and their rights in the land. They resent any Jewish claims to be the " chosen people " or to hold any title to the land comparable to that of the Moslems. They charge that the British administration in Palestine is controlled by the Jewish agency, that the land management is unjust to them, that most of the economic concessions have been given to Jews, and that in general their situation was more favorable under the Turkish régime. Such views have been freely expressed in the various Arab congresses that have been held in recent years, such as the All Palestine Arab Congress, the Women's Congress, the Students' Congress, the Villagers' Congress, and the Arab Economic Congress held in Haifa in November 1929. There are answers to these complaints on both sides. The point is that there are these sharp differences, and as the Wailing Wall commission affirmed, " unless the differences between the two races are settled, there is no prospect of successful realization of Jewish projects nor progressive development of the Arab people."

There is a more moderate opinion, to the effect that Zionism will proceed with its program, and by continued contributions of funds, labor and initiative it will win through at last to its great objectives. Enthusiastic and courageous Zionists are insistent that in accordance with the program formulated by their leaders the land will be occupied gradually by members of their race intent on the realization of the material and spiritual ideals of their people. As they view the matter, the Arab population, now some four-fifths of the inhabitants, will increasingly appreciate the advantage of having these thrifty, industrious, progressive people as their neighbors, and make room for them. They believe that Palestine is capable of supporting a population many times the size of that now living there. They think that improved methods of agriculture, irrigation and engineering will rapidly develop the present modest if not meagre resources of the country, and that in time the Jewish element in the population will come to dominate both in numbers and political control. In this manner the dream of a homeland for the Jews is to come true.

Improved methods of agriculture and fruit production will bring the economic resources of the land to higher values. This will benefit both the Jewish and the Arab population. It must be remembered that few of the experiments made have become commercially profitable as yet. Some of the colonies have yielded a profit. Others are and will continue to be dependent on Zionist funds provided from abroad. This is equally true of much of the improvement achieved in other directions, such as roads, industries, education and other institutional and social experiments. For these purposes large sums of money have been supplied by Jews from Europe and America in a spirit of splendid generosity. It is said that almost $34,000,000 has been spent by the Zionist organization for the reconstruction of Palestine since the Balfour declaration was issued. Can this large income to Zionist treasuries be counted on indefinitely? The prices paid for the land are high, much higher than the value of the property warrants in many instances. Yet the Jews desire the land, and the Arabs covet the price. Complaints are made of the threatened bankruptcy of Zionist organizations. Will the Jews of the outlying world maintain the same spirit of devotion and sacrifice in the future which has characterized the years of enthusiastic promotion of the Zionist ideal? If so and Zionism succeeds on its proposed lines it will be recognized as one of the major achievements of history.

Others among the Jewish people believe that the obstacles in its way, physical, economic and political, are insuperable, and that with the gradually increasing restrictions to Jewish immigration which are already drastic, the entire movement will take its place among the episodes of the centuries.

It must be kept in mind that there are great numbers of Jews in many parts of the world who are in a general way sympathetic with the aspiration of their race and are willing to contribute to funds for the care of pensioner Jews in Palestine and for the rehabilitation of the land, who are not much concerned with the eager ambitions of Zionists for a national homeland. They feel that Palestine ought to be open and hospitable to Jew and non-Jew alike, and that the heroic and sacrificial service which many Jews have rendered to the country and to their people is worthy of the fullest recognition and praise. They have the conviction voiced in statesmanlike utterances by representative Jews that the Balfour declaration should not be given the extravagant interpretation which the political Zionists have given it. For example Chancellor Magnes says that, " Palestine is a land *sui generis,* sacred to three great religions; it should always be under international control through a mandatory. This is probably the only way for safeguarding international obligations here, and of guaranteeing to all elements of the population — the majority as well as the minorities — their equal rights and privileges, including immigration, settlement on the land, and the living of a free cultural life."

It is a satisfaction to observe the efforts which are being made toward a better understanding between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. The council of the Jewish agency for Palestine meeting in Basle in 1930 went on record unanimously as having a " sincere desire for the creation of a durable understanding between Jews and Arabs in Palestine on the basis of mutual confidence and respect." The hope has been expressed that the University in Jerusalem may render valuable service by its equal opportunities offered to Jews and Arabs, and that in the classrooms a new basis of understanding may be found. Interesting suggestions have been made regarding the cantonization of Palestine on the basis of local majorities, which units might have representation in a congress or parliament under the mandate power. But most constructive of all have been the utterances of such Zionist leaders as Chancellor Magnes and Professor Einstein, that the first and greatest task of Zionism is the cultivation of amicable relations with the Arabs who are their neighbors, and must be their cooperants in the rehabilitation and development of Palestine.

That land is equally dear to Christians, Jews and Moslems. Its holy places are alike cherished by the confessors of the three faiths. It must ever remain open and hospitable to them and to all others who desire to visit it. Its political status, whether British, Jewish, Arab or international must be such as to guarantee the rights of all who come and go. The Jews have, and must always have, the same privileges accorded to all who wish to travel or to reside in the land. Can they ask for more? As a race and a religion, do they wish for more?

There is another aspect of the matter which demands a word. Many Zionists insist that Israel's ethical and spiritual message to the world can never be delivered adequately until the Jews have a local habitation as well as a name. Thus they believe that the possession of Palestine is not for the purpose of dislodging its present population, which would be impossible, nor as a homeland in the sense of an actual residence for any considerable proportion of their race, which would be a fantastic expectation; but rather as a symbol of Jewish ideals, a place where Jews might live in safety and independence, carrying on their mission of good will and brotherhood, and thus pervading the world with their racial aims. This is a noble and worthy ambition. But is the possession of Palestine necessary to any such moral and religious leadership as the best Jews rightly crave? Many of their leaders believe otherwise. They are of the opinion that it would be a distinct step backward, a retreat from the worldwide platform of Judaism to the doubtful and difficult adventure of geographical and political struggle. Might it not actually lose some of the authority it enjoyed when it stood unhampered by any political responsibilities? It is for the thoughtful to say. But surely it is a fair question whether Judaism, now a religious power of unquestioned vitality and dominion in wide areas of human life, would gain or lose by involvement in the ever-changing and ever-baffling Palestine problem.[19]

As long as the Jews were the victims of persecution and outrage in the lands of their occupation it was inevitable that they should dream of a homeland where they might be at peace and work out their cultural and religious ideals. But the new world of today is open to them with growing freedom and opportunity. The Jew is respected and honored in all the regions where he has exhibited his powers in the fields of industry, commerce, politics, art and literature. Does he really desire to possess a small, poverty-stricken and unresourceful land like Palestine which is already so largely in the possession of another race? The Jews are a practical people, perhaps the most practical in the world. Is the remaking of Palestine a practicable enterprise? Perhaps it is. It is a question for them to decide. No one else has any right of decision or any special interest in the question, save on grounds of sentiment.

---

[19] Rabbi Silver writes: "Two thousand years of heroic suffering and martyrdom cannot find their compensation in the right to play the rôle of a pitifully small State in the World of political intrigue, a pawn in the hands of scheming international diplomats." — *The Democratic Impulse in Jewish History,* p. 25.

XIII

THE JEW TODAY AND TOMORROW

Of no other race is the world so conscious as of the Jews. They are the universal people, found in almost every land, and marked by characteristics which draw the attention of those among whom they live. These are sometimes marks of a physical type, but more frequently mannerisms and forms of speech. There are other racial groups which are more distinctively recognized in certain parts of the world, and in a measure set apart either by popular approval or dislike, as in the case of orientals on the Pacific coast, or Negroes in portions of the United States, or the nationals of any country that has been the victim of war prejudice, like the Japanese in China, the Americans in Europe in the days of the Spanish War, or the Germans in any of the allied lands.

But the Jew is recognized wherever he goes. This recognition is sometimes friendly and sometimes hostile, but it tends to be universal. In some instances the Jew is proud of the place he holds in the world's regard, whether it is that of approval or of dislike, and sometimes he is deeply sensitive to the sentiment of aversion which many of his people excite. In the latter instances he may attempt to hide his racial status by change of name or by taking refuge in non-Jewish groups into which he is able to gain admission, or he may be indifferent to other than Jewish opinion, finding ample compensation in the consciousness of his history and culture, and the importance of the place he holds in the life of the world. Whatever else may be true of the Jews, they are the universal race, found in all lands and represented in nearly all the vocations and avocations of humanity.

Of certain claims often made in reference to them there are no proofs, and intelligent Jews are increasingly aware of the fact. The first is the assumption of the Hebraic origin of the Jews; another is that of their racial purity. The facts regarding these claims have been set forth in previous chapters. The Jew has made himself and the world believe in his derivation from the Hebrew stock, in the fact that biblical references are made to his future restoration to Palestine, and in the purity and integrity of his blood inheritance. In these claims he has been supported by uncritical and sentimental Christian opinion. For none of them is there a basis of fact. Yet in regard to these assumptions the Jew has nothing to regret. His descent from the late and decadent Hebrew life of Judah in the fifth century before the present era would have been nothing to his credit, and indeed would have proved a handicap. There are no biblical texts which refer to the present or future generation of Jews, or their political prospects.

And as for purity of blood, no scholar, Jewish or other, would affirm that either at the beginning of the Jewish state or at any time since has the race been of unmixed stock. In fact one of the chief elements of its vigor and genius has been the constant intermixture of many strains in its life. Most races which have had any degree of world contact have revealed the same pattern of mingled racial elements — Egyptians, Hebrews, Hindus, Greeks, Romans, Europeans of most groups, and most of all, Americans. But none compare with the Jews, whose life has been cast in many lands, and has been subjected to every form of racial misadventure and oppression. That their survival has been possible is one of the miracles of history. The entire story of the Jew has been one of suffering and heroism which merits the admiration and good will of mankind, and above all other groups, of Christians. The words of Frederick Hosmer's noble hymn may well be paraphrased in reference to the Jew:

> "For thee the fathers suffered, for thee they toiled and prayed;
> Upon thy holy altar their willing lives they laid;
> Thou hast no common birthright, great memories on thee shine;
> The blood of all the nations commingled flows in thine."

As Felix Adler, himself a Jew, has rightly said, the high-bred members of the race reveal "noble qualities in versatility of thought, brilliancy of imagination, flashing humor, in what the French call *esprit;* in powerful lyrical outpourings, in impassioned eloquence, in the power of experiencing and uttering profound emotions." In these and many other characteristics of high order the Jew shows himself to be a member of a universal race.

The Jewish claims referred to — those of Hebrew origin, of biblical predictive status, and of purity of stock — are of no particular importance so far as world opinion is concerned. Their factual or fictional nature is merely a matter of historical and scientific inquiry. No one has any controversy with those Jews who find satisfaction in such claims. It is on wholly different grounds that their significance and value as a people rest, and these grounds of culture, industry, morality and religion afford them the right to an ample place in the appreciation and good will of mankind.

Jews reveal the traits both physical and mental of almost every people and culture. Scattered widely as they have been for centuries, they have absorbed many of the characteristics of those among whom they have lived. Held together in a remarkable relationship by group loyalty, by historic traditions and by differing degrees of religious fidelity, they have naturally imbibed many of the elements of their local environments, such as language, national or regional patterns of thinking and behavior, vocational and trade characteristics. Through all variations of distribution, culture and experience they maintain everywhere certain remarkable resemblances which are distinguishing and often unmistakable. These are not necessarily facial. It is often affirmed that one can tell a Jew on sight. This is of course an exaggeration. There are many Jews who show not the slightest trace of racial peculiarity. Nor is it possible to identify Jews by any specific features, such as noses, eyes, hair, facial contour, complexion or other tokens. In many instances one or more of these marks may be present. In many others no one of them is observed. And yet the racial signs are unmistakable. No physiognomist has ever been able to point out the definite and invariable fashion of a Jewish face. Yet in most instances they are not difficult of identification. It would seem that this racial resemblance is less a quality of physical pattern than of manner, speech and disposition, variable as these may be. As in the case of other races they tend to disappear by contact and absorption with other groups.[1]

If there are distinct differences between Jews and the people of other racial strains, not less marked are the variations among themselves. These differences are of every sort, physiological, regional, social, economic, educational, religious. The Sephardic Jew in Europe has held a certain level of aristocracy. In America he has been the poorest and the least fortunate of his people. The Jew of the Askenazim group on the other hand has belonged to the lower stratum of population in Europe, but by his energy and thrift has prospered in the United States. And between the two groups on either continent there has been little affection. In fact there is no prejudice more intense than that which is exhibited by certain groups of Jews toward other Jews, such as that felt by German Jews toward those of eastern Europe, or that displayed by many Orthodox Jews toward those of modernist views, or that of the radical Zionists toward those of the race who are indifferent to that adventure. In some cases this results from an inferiority complex; in others it is the issue of deep-going differences in conviction.

Jews are of many sorts, some of them well-bred, cultured and pleasing in manners, and others ignorant, rude, arrogant and disagreeable. Many of the latter class hardly realize how unfavorable is the impression they make. It is fortunate that in a free social order like that of the United States a man may rise from the ghetto to a boulevard in a single generation. But even this change does not always

[1] See pages 20, 158, 159.

involve the disappearance of his ghetto characteristics. Too often he retains unconsciously the peculiarities of the immigrant — language, manners and modes of thinking. Unfortunately, it is those who are most objectionable in their manners who attract attention and create an unfavorable opinion regarding the race in general. In this respect they are like some types of Americans traveling in Europe. As one of them writes, " certain tendencies among the uneducated and illiterate give rise to unlovely and unpleasant idiosyncrasies, a certain restlessness, loudness of manner, fondness of display, a lack of dignity, reserve, repose. And since one loud person attracts greater attention than twenty who are modest and refined, it has come about that the whole race is often condemned because of the follies of some of the coarsest and least representative of its members."

One recalls many varieties of Jews, as different one from another as though they belonged to different races. There are the typical Jews of the Whitechapel Road section of London. There are the crowds of noisy and gesticulating Jews from the East Side, who pour out from clothing factories in side streets into Fifth Avenue at the noon-hour and fill all that section of New York with their clamor. There are those who constitute the ghetto types of Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati and St. Louis, and whose market areas seem like bits of busy life transported from Frankfort, Vienna or Moscow. There is the Chicago Jewry in the old Maxwell Street district, now moving gradually into North Lawndale. There are the loud-voiced commercial Jews one sees in the smoking compartments of Pullman coaches, whose conversation deals only in sums running into the millions, even if there is the suspicion that a hundred dollars would tax their resources. There are the aggressive, pushful Jews, whose chief ambition appears to be to invade residence sections and hotels where they are unwelcome, and who will adopt any means, however dishonest or offensive, to accomplish their object. There is the Jew whose aggressive qualities have made him the master of wide reaches of the industrial and commercial world. Arriving in the steerage, he found a place as janitor in a New York structure, and his growing family did sweatshop work for a clothing firm. In a few years he had become the possessor of the building, and of several adjacent buildings. Today his children and those of other Jews are the masters of whole sections of the business of the United States — the clothing trade, the department stores, the theatrical business, the moving picture industry and a score of other enterprises, to say nothing of a majority share in the teaching activity of the public schools of several cities, and in some places even the invasion of the police force, in which the Irish have been supposed to hold a monopoly.

On the other hand, the Jew of the educated type, whether in business or the professions, exhibits an order of culture and refinement which makes him a valuable citizen and a delightful companion. The Jewish rabbis are on the average superior in educational equipment and in continuing scholarship to any other class of religious leaders, Protestant or Catholic. The philanthropies of high-minded Jews, not only in behalf of their own people but in the interest of all good causes — educational, civic, benevolent, religious —

have given them a place of esteem in the regard of the citizenship of Europe and America.

Probably in no field are the ambition and persistence of Jews more in evidence than in that of education. In every grade of school from the primary to the university Jewish boys and girls, encouraged by ambitious parents, are eager seekers for entrance and earnest in their pursuit of excellence. In fact this has become the cause of alarm on the part of college and university officials. The popular prejudice against the Jew has subjected him to every form of repression in his quest for education. To keep down the percentage of Jewish students without appearing to do so has exercised the ingenuity of many presidents, deans and faculties. It is a process never quite successful, because Jewish students are among the most alert and insistent to be found in educational institutions of all grades, and their determination to secure the advantages of such discipline is not to be defeated by hardship or racial discrimination.

A Jewish youth has to face exclusion from the usual fraternity life of the campus. His only resort is the creation of fraternities of his own race.[2] In many other regards he is conscious of exclusion. This tends naturally to the establishment of a Jewish *bloc,* whose members stand together in such interests as enlist their activity. If they gain the reputation of clannishness, as is often the case, it is less the result of their preference than of the treatment they receive from their non-Jewish fellow students. It is probable that the

---

[2] These associations are both of the secular fraternity type and of religious character. The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation has established Jewish student centers in connection with the Universities of Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan, California, West Virginia and Texas, and at Cornell University.

Jewish members of college and university groups are often less popular than others because as a rule they are industrious and intelligent. They have a single purpose in their work, and are not so likely to be diverted from the main object by other interests, social and athletic. The average student too frequently dislikes to allow his studies to interfere with his college work. The Jewish boy has little of that kind of prejudice. It is not too much to say that Jewish students by their hard study and industry have had a measurable influence in raising the standards for admission and graduation in American schools.

If Jews are characterized by marked variations in type, in vocation, in culture and in manners, not less do they differ in religious alignment. Judaism presents three strikingly different groups — the Orthodox, the Reform or Liberal, and the Zionist. These are not wholly separated, or necessarily distinct in all regards. There are, for example, Zionists in both the Orthodox and the Liberal sections. And all three have gradations of commitment which amount almost to group divisions.

The Orthodox section includes those Jews who have come more immediately from the ghetto populations of Europe or who have retained more fully on American soil the habits and thinking of European Jewry. Among those of them who remain faithful to their religion the synagogue service is maintained with devoted loyalty to the conservative traditions of Judaism. The sacred rolls of the Torah and the remaining books of the scripture are held in the same veneration in their chests as are the consecrated elements of the eucharist in the Roman Catholic church. The sacred days of the calendar are kept both in the homes and synagogue. The Shema is repeated as a duty and privilege.[3] The Passover, Rosh ha-Shana, the Day of Atonement and the other feasts and fasts are times of solemn observance with fitting garments and behavior. The synagogue is the community center of the local group with much of the same sanctity it possessed in the middle ages, when it was both a place of worship and a refuge. The rules of conduct prescribed in the *Shulchan Aruch* are observed with much greater fidelity than in more liberal circles. The reading of the Old Testament is a feature of family life, and the study of the Talmud is more obligatory in rabbinical circles than among Reform Jews.

Naturally in a new world environment and in the modern age the Orthodox Jew finds the problem of loyalty to ancient forms and beliefs increasingly difficult, particularly in the religious experience of his children. Complaint is often heard among them that the younger generation tends to neglect the obligations of the synagogue, and even of the home, and to lapse into paganism. This, of course, is not exclusively a Jewish problem in a scientific and questioning generation. The same tension is felt in Christian circles, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. Among the Jews it is particularly felt in small communities where the group influence is weak. The beliefs of the Orthodox Jew are deep-going and sincere. His is an intense monotheism which resents the Christian assumption of the deity of Jesus as an unwarranted invasion of the divine unity. He is willing to concede the impressive character of Jesus, but not as superior to the Hebrew prophets, whom he insists on identifying with his own race. As to the messianic hope, he has either dismissed it as a vain expectation of the past or holds it as still possible of realization, through the coming of some great prophet or in the fulfillment of Zionist hopes. But his people have suffered so sorely through the years as the result of Christian misunderstanding and persecution that the memory of Christmas and Easter pogroms in Europe is vivid and ineffaceable, and his contact with Christians is likely to be commercial, formal and reserved. His home and his synagogue are his sanctuaries, where the Sabbath is kept with fidelity, the dietetic tabus of the Torah are observed, and his family and friends are as far as possible his exclusive circle.

---

[3] The *Shema* ("Hear, O Israel") is the beautiful passage in Deut. 6:4–9, which is a fitting confession of faith.

Reform or Liberal Judaism exhibits a distinct break with the older order of the Orthodox. The public service of the temple or synagogue is at once more simplified and more beautiful. There is no line of separation between men and women. Part of the worship occurs on the Sabbath and part of it on Sunday. The preaching is less the exposition of scriptural and talmudic texts than the presentation of modern themes, such as Christian ministers find worthful.[4] Liberal Judaism has largely freed itself from the legalism of early and mediaeval teachings, and rests back upon the ethical and spiritual ideals of the prophets and the psalmists of Israel. It reveres the Old Testament, and respects the Talmud. It repeats the Shema with devotion. But for the dogmas and rules of the *Shulchan Aruch* it has no use as binding upon conscience or conduct. Its attitude toward the dietetic and other laws of the Torah is free, though not necessarily indifferent. Marriage and divorce are treated as modern social facts, and not as matters of regulation in accordance with rabbinical law. It accepts the common scholarly attitude toward evolution and other scientific truths as disclosed in the discoveries of the age, and the results of critical inquiry in the field of biblical literature. It is not interested in the older Jewish prayers for the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem or the restoration of the sacrificial cultus.

---

[4] One is often intrigued in attending a Jewish service with the frequent quotations in Hebrew from the Old Testament. It is improbable that any of the members of the congregation, save in rare instances, have any knowledge of Hebrew, and it is unfair to a cultured rabbi to imagine that he is resorting to the device merely for purposes of pedantry or ostentation. There was a time when Christian ministers were much addicted to learned quotations in Hebrew, Greek or Latin, in spite of the fact that such a display of erudition was wholly valueless as a homiletic aid. The wonder is that some rabbis still employ it.

Naturally Liberal Judaism, true to the historic attitude of the synagogue, rejects the Christian doctrines of the trinity, the atonement, and the superior value of the New Testament. But while finding no place in its creed for any type of Christology such as Christianity professes, its attitude toward Jesus is appreciative and reverent. It is conscious that the Jews gave him to the world, and that Judaism has a message regarding his universal values to which the church might well give heed. Its messianic hope centers not in a person nor in Zionistic dreams regarding a repossessed Palestine, as some of its people insist. At its best it is concerned with an aroused and consecrated Judaism possessing a vital and world-wide evangel of justice, peace and brotherhood, a spirit of good will for which the nations wait.

Its emphasis is upon God, humanity and the social virtues. It sets its face against all forms of privileges and militarism. In many features Liberal Judaism resembles Unitarianism, in which communion in fact many Jews have found a church home.

But Judaism, both Orthodox and Liberal, has many problems to face today. One of its best known interpreters writes of it in these words: "We are going through the throes of theological disintegration. There are many Jews today whose loyalty to the synogague is just as attenuated as the loyalty of thousands of Christians to the church. There are those who continue to support the synagogue for purely sentimental reasons or because they too are not brave enough to break completely, but follow the line of least resistance. Of course, with us there is this great difference: Christendom really at heart would not welcome the Jew, all the efforts at conversion to the contrary notwithstanding. But we Jews are faced with the same problem as our Christian brethren: How shall we rebuild the structure of religious life which is falling about our heads? This is as true of Orthodox Jews as it is of Reform or Liberal Jews. . . . What is the Jew? Is he a race? Is he a denomination such as Protestant or Catholic? Is he a nation in the sense that the French or English are nations? Is he a nationality? What is nationality? Why should the Jew continue to refuse to intermarry? Why should he retain his distinctiveness? What is the 'mission of the Jew'? In what sense, if any, is he a 'chosen people'? What compromises in thinking and conduct will he be called upon and can he make without sacrificing his identity? How can he maintain his integrity and why? Our best critical thought today is engaged in examining anew the foundations of our beliefs and our purposes."[5]

Zionists constitute a third section of the race, although, as already stated, their numbers usually belong either among the Orthodox or the Reformed. But to the true Zionist the problem of Palestine is more important than the differences between the two classes among his people, although Zionists differ radically among themselves over the puzzle which Palestine presents. That problem has been given consideration in the last two chapters, and requires no restatement here.

The world's debt to the Jew in almost every area of activity is too great to be recorded in a paragraph. In literature Jews have held a notable place, such names as Heine and Spinoza suggesting many others. To all the arts Jews have made significant contributions, of which the names of Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, Offenbach, Goldmark, Rubenstein, Hoffman, Heifetz and Kreisler in the single field of music are a suggestion. Karl Marx is the commanding figure in the domain of socialism. In science Michelson and Einstein are names significant of leadership. In the domain of philanthropy, Nathan Straus and Julius Rosenwald have been conspicuous, and many other Jews have given evidence of the same spirit. The place of the Jew in the story of America has been important. Santangel the capitalist, De Torres the soldier, Gerson the navigator, Cresques the mapmaker and Ibn Ezra the astronomer and mathematician were helpers in Columbus' discovery of the continent. His first letters home were sent in acknowledgment to the Jews Santangel and Sanchez. From that time onward the place and services of Jews in American history have been impressive, and have found frequent recital.

---

[5] Rabbi Morris G. Lazaron, Baltimore, Maryland, in "Unity," June 15, 1931.

In spite, however, of all the contributions made by the Jew to civilization in America and other parts of the world, he still suffers the results of unfriendly patterns of thought carried over from the middle ages. The fact that Christians degraded the Jews by shutting them away in ghettos, denying them the right to own land, prohibiting them from the pursuit of normal occupations, forcing them to wear garments which were badges of disgrace, persecuting them for being Jews, attempting to force them into baptism, and destroying their sacred books, has left a long and bitter heritage of antagonism which will require time and resolute effort to overcome. It has produced a vicious stereotype in the attitude of most non-Jews toward that unhappy race.

There is discrimination against Jews in employment which makes it difficult for them to secure positions except among their own people. To be known as a Jew is frequently sufficient to shut the doors of clubs or hotels, or to prevent entrance into desirable residence sections, quite regardless of the character or culture of the applicant. It is not strange that escape has been sought in multitudes of cases by change of name, or by the adoption of another faith. Anti-Semitism, although it is a misnomer, continues in America, where it has least excuse for existence. Defamatory uses of the word " Jew " are encountered, as though it were synonymous with " usurer " and " undesirable." Such characterizations are frequently unconscious and not intentionally discourteous, as the Anti-defamation Commission of the B'nai B'rith has revealed. All the more do they disclose the bias of popular speech. The dissemination of anti-Jewish literature is a potent source of ill will. One of the most discreditable journalistic campaigns in the history of the country was maintained for many months against Jews by a wealthy manufacturer, only to collapse at last by its own falsehood and futility. No intelligent Jew is longer offended by the portrait of " Shylock," which as everyone knows, is not to be taken seriously as more than a type in the England of Shakespeare's time, when there were practically no Jews in the land.

Yet the members of that race suffer many disabilities, both economic and social, in Europe and the United States. Even physical violence is not wholly a thing of the past. In Saloniki, where a large proportion of the population is Jewish, a mob attacked and wrecked the offices of the Maccabees society during the summer of 1931 under the impulse of race prejudice. In Berlin, at the festival of Rosh ha-Shana in the autumn of the same year, anti-Jewish riots spread terror and violence in the Jewish quarter. In Cracow, Warsaw and other Polish university centers, student riots were organized a month later against the Jews because of their refusal to deliver bodies for dissection. Conflicts in which the Jews are the objects of attacks are frequently reported, chiefly in Poland, Roumania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Such reports read like the stories of outrages committed in the ghettos of the middle ages.

These and similar events are the result of racial, nationalistic and religious prejudices, as senseless as they are cruel. As Julius Drachsler writes: " They are fundamentally socially conditioned reactions. There are no instinctive prejudices. All are socially created. The only ' instinctive ' element is the capacity to develop either in one direction or in the other. The social environment into which a child is born is replete with admonitions, positive and negative, which tend accumulatively to fix attitudes. Think of the complex of influences that relentlessly, steadily bear down on the Polish child with reference to his Jewish neighbors. Thus we begin to get an idea of this conditioning process that has its source in environment."[6] Children have no such prejudices until they are inoculated with the group hatreds which prevail in their families. Jewish and non-Jewish boys form close and enduring friendships. Unfriendliness toward the Jew is a vicious social neurosis toward an " out group." Such groups are always the objects of suspicion. We believe evil of them. We damage them. We discriminate against them. We keep away from them. One of the tests of a militant and efficient Christianity is its vigorous protest against race prejudice in every form. The next great step in American education ought to be the extension of intelligence and the expansion of the areas of good will by means of which boys and girls of all faiths shall be released from religious and racial prejudice. They will thus be led to cooperate in the building of an ethical and spiritual civilization which can meet and overcome the mechanized and material pattern of life now prevalent. With that type of education

[6] Bruno Lasker, *Jewish Experiences in America,* p. 92.

there will come a measurable disappearance of racial and religious prejudices.

The closer approach of Christians and Jews to each other is one of the important problems of the present period. It would seem that the ineffective method is that of Christian missions to Jews. With no sentiment but one of good will toward the earnest and sacrificial men and women who are promoting missions among the Jews, it would seem that the greater need of the time is such friendliness on the part of Christians toward Jews as shall result in a coöperative effort for social ends without loss of appreciation of both Jewish and Christian forms of belief. The best religious service which a Christian can render a Jew is to encourage him in loyalty to his ancestral faith. There is far greater value, both to the individual and to society, in that fidelity to the fundamental elements of religion which are found both in Judaism and Christianity than in the transfer of men and women from the one confession to the other. One is not unmindful of the hope cherished by the apostle Paul that his Jewish brethren might all share the satisfaction which he found in the gospel. It was the misfortune both of Judaism and Christianity that mistakes in the strategy of coöperation at the beginnings of the Christian movement — mistakes on both sides — rendered such hopes as Paul's abortive, and the experience of later centuries widened the breach. That chasm is not to be closed by any process of proselyting, but by growing appreciation each of the other, and by friendly coöperation in congenial tasks. The terms " Christian " and " Jew " should cease to connote two hostile cultures. They have too much in common to warrant such estrangement.

These terms ought to stand for the best in the two confessions, as Lessing makes clear in his much-quoted lines, in which he has the Christian monk say to the Jewish Nathan:

> "Heaven bless us;
> That which makes me to you a Christian
> Makes you to me a Jew."

Christians could become much more Christian than they are in their attitude toward Jews, and Jews might also cultivate a more friendly spirit.

Among the methods which are proving of value in the cultivation of good will and the removal of the tragic reality of prejudice between Jews and Christians is the fostering of friendly relations in gatherings where exchange of opinion and social appreciation can be promoted. Jewish rabbis are being invited to membership in ministerial associations and other conferential groups. No society for biblical research or religious discussion would think of depriving itself of the values derived from the presence and contributions of Jewish scholars.[7] They should be asked to fill Christian pulpits and to give lectures to Christian audiences. Both in culture and courtesy their appearance would be of high value. Such contacts would prove of lasting advantage, and would be appreciated and reciprocated.

In recent months more direct and purposeful relations between Christians and Jews have been promoted under the auspices of the "Committee on Goodwill between Jews and

---

[7] An example of friendly coöperation between Christian and Jewish scholars is the recent dedication by Professor G. Bear of his edition of the Mishna Ms. Codex Kaufman, A 50. to the Jerusalem University (JAOS. Mar. 1931, p. 80).

Christians" of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The purpose of this committee and the conferences held under its direction is "to unite Jews and Christians in Goodwill; and to promote coöperation in behalf of a social order more nearly based on those ideals of justice, fellowship, and peace which are common to the prophetic traditions of Jews and Christians alike." Meetings at which representatives of both faiths have spoken in interpretative and friendly spirit have been held in more than a hundred communities, including several colleges and universities. A significant comment was made by Mr. Edward A. Filene, the well-known Jewish merchant and philanthropist of Boston, to the effect that the most potent cure for anti-Semitism would be the support of the social service program of the Federal Council of Churches by American Jews. There are Jewish journals such as "The American Hebrew" which might be read to advantage by members of the Christian community, just as there are scholarly volumes produced by Jewish writers which are welcomed both in Jewish and non-Jewish circles.

The attitude which gives the best promise of friendliness and mutual appreciation on the part both of Jews and Christians is a resolute determination to forget the mistakes and sins of the past and to cultivate a new spirit of good will. The Christian is humbled by the memory of a past which is dark with hatred, cruelty and prejudice toward the Jew. But there is no virtue in mere sentimental regrets. The immeasurable contributions made by the Jew to civilization, morality and religion place the Church under obligation to join forces with the Synagogue in the effort to bring in the era of brotherhood and peace for which the world waits. On the other hand, the Jew needs to avoid morbid and self-pitying complacency over his unhappy past, and taking advantage of the immense political and social releases which have come to him in western Europe and the United States, to set himself afresh to the high tasks of caring for the poor and unfortunate of his own race, and of meeting purposefully the opportunities and obligations for cultural, ethical and spiritual leadership for which his training and experience have prepared him.

His duty is not alone to his own people, definite and essential as that may be. It is to an entire needy and perplexed humanity that the message of Jewish faith and courage ought to come. The word spoken by the Hebrew prophet to his people long ago might well come to leaderlike Jews today: "It is too slight a thing for your being my servant merely to raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the survivors of Israel. I will make you a light of the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth."[8] On Jew and Christian alike rests the obligation which both have inherited from the prophetic past to mediate light and direction not to a single race but to all mankind. As long as the Jewish community produces modern prophets of the type of Abba Hillel Silver, Louis L. Mann, Rudolph I. Coffee, Stephen S. Wise, Harry Levi and others in a long list of distinguished rabbis and teachers, its obligation, like that of the Christian church, is clear and emphatic. Its messianic hope lies not in a single age or locality, but in a community consecrated to the good life and to world peace. The Zion of its dreams is

[8] Isa. 49:6.

not in Palestine but in all the lands of Jewish habitation. Its language is no one dialect, however historic or sacred, but the universal language of all the nations among whom it lives.

And in the fuller attainment of such a world mission, the Jew may well come as many of his people have already come, to a truer appreciation of Jesus and a more positive attitude toward him. As long as he was interpreted under a trinitarian formula, the strict monotheism of Jews was shocked and repelled. With the passing of that conception of deity, a new door opens to Jewish and Christian fellowship, and to a recognition of Jesus as the chief contribution of Jewish life to the world, the prophet and teacher whose words hang in the air like banners, and whose sentences walk through all the earth like spirits. The most distinguished rabbi and teacher in the Chicago of the last generation spoke habitually of Jesus as "the Savior." It was a term of reverence, even of affection, and carried no implication of dogmatic Christian beliefs. But it made easier the contacts between Christian and Jew. No Christian need surrender anything of his faith in the supreme redemptive ministry of the Man of Nazareth, nor need the Jew abdicate his position of firm and uncompromising monotheism. But there is ample ground for fellowship within the wide circle of Jesus' life and ideals, and each should be able to abate, under the spell of his personality and all-embracing love, the misunderstandings and estrangements of the past. The Jew will not become a Christian, at least not until the Christian is more worthy of the name he bears. But in the broad area of biblical ideals, where Jesus the Jew remains, as all would confess, the central figure of history, there is room for a fellowship of faith and service in which Christians and Jews of every order may happily join.

What is the future of the Jews as a race? With the removal of economic barriers, and the attainment of freedom in all the western world, will it not be increasingly difficult for them to remain a separate and coherent group? Will the desire to mingle with the non-Jewish world in social life, in scholarly pursuits and in the promotion of better citizenship and morality prove too strong for the habit of racial segregation? Has the Jew survived thus far as a separate type chiefly by reason of pressure and persecution from without? And when that pressure is removed, as it is gradually disappearing, and the Jews are welcomed increasingly into the wider circles of the social order, what can prevent their absorption and disappearance, a fate which has overtaken so many racial units in the past? The tendency is obvious. The numbers of Jews who have merged with other peoples is vastly greater than the total company that remains. The two strongest factors in their racial persistence have been their loyalty to the Torah and the centripetal effect of persecution. Both these factors are losing their force today. Will such facts imperil to a serious degree the integrity and persistence of Jewish life? The answers are various, and none of them is conclusive. But whatever the individual opinion may be, it is certain that the Jew who has survived so many mutations of fortune in the past will remain an important element in the life of humanity for a long time to come, and that his place in the history of world affairs, of culture and of religion will be determined far less by outward influences, such as have shaped his career to so large a degree in the centuries gone by, than by the courageous and determined attitude of the leaders of his own race on whom so high a degree of opportunity and obligation has fallen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE BIBLE TEXT

English Revised Version, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1886.

American Standard Bible, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1901.

The Holy Scriptures, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1917.

The Holy Bible, A New Translation, by James Moffatt, George H. Doran Company, New York, 1926.

The Bible, An American Translation, by J. M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931.

THE BIBLE

BOOTH, HARRY KENDALL, *The Background of the Bible,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1928.

FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON, *The Modern Use of the Bible,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924.

WILLETT, HERBERT L., *The Bible Through the Centuries,* Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago, 1929.

PALESTINE

SMITH, GEORGE ADAM, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land,* A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1904.

LUKE, HARRY CHARLES, and KEITH-ROACH, EDWARD, eds., *Handbook of Palestine,* The Macmillan Company, London, 1930.

GARSTANG, JOHN, *Foundations of Bible History,* Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1931.

FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON, *A Pilgrimage to Palestine,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927.

OLMSTEAD, A. T., *History of Palestine and Syria, to the Macedonian Conquest,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1931.

BIBLICAL HISTORY

FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J., *Biblical History of the Hebrews,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1921.

KENT, CHARLES FOSTER, *A History of the Hebrew People,* 2 vols., Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1921.

RIGGS, JAMES STEPHENSON, and KENT, CHARLES FOSTER, *A History of the Jewish People,* 2 vols., Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1903.

WILD, LAURA H., *The Evolution of the Hebrew People,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1917.

LOFTHOUSE, W. F., *Israel After the Exile,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1928.

RADIN, MAX, *Life of the People in Biblical Times,* Jewish Publication Society, Philadephia, 1929.

MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G., *The Old Testament and After,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1923.

HEBREW RELIGION

KITTEL, R., *The Religion of the People of Israel,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925.

BARTON, GEORGE A., *The Religion of Israel,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1918.

FOWLER, HENRY THATCHER, *Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1916.

OTTLEY, R. L., *The Religion of Israel,* The University Press, Cambridge, 1905.

BUDDE, KARL, *The Religion of Israel to the Exile,* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1899.

CHEYNE, T. K., *Jewish Religious Life After the Exile,* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1898.

NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

SCHÜRER, EMIL, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ,* 5 vols., Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1896.

MATHEWS, SHAILER, *New Testament Times in Palestine,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1900.

LAKE, KIRSOPP, *Landmarks in Early Christianity,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922.

NORTON, FREDERICK OWEN, *The Rise of Christianity,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1924.

CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, *The Evolution of Early Christianity,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1914.

CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, *The Social Origins of Christianity,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1923.

JESUS

CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, *Jesus, A New Biography,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1927.

BARTON, GEORGE A., *Jesus of Nazareth,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922.

KLAUSNER, JOSEPH, *Jesus of Nazareth,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

ENELOW, HYMAN G., *A Jewish View of Jesus,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

JACOBS, JOSEPH, *Jesus as Others Saw Him,* B. G. Richards Company, New York, 1929.

WALKER, THOMAS, *Jewish Views of Jesus,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1931.

HIRSCH, E. G., *The Crucifixion from a Jewish Standpoint,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1921.

MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G., *The Synoptic Gospels,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927.

McCOWN, CHESTER CHARLTON, *The Genesis of the Social Gospel,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1929.

THE PHARISEES

ABRAHAMS, I., *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels,* 2 vols., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924.

HERFORD, R., TRAVERS, *Pharisaism: Its Aim and Its Method,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1924.

HERFORD, R., TRAVERS, *The Pharisees,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924.

ROBERTSON, A. T., *The Pharisees and Jesus,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1920.

RIDDLE, DONALD W., *Jesus and The Pharisees,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1928.

JUDAISM

ABRAHAMS, ISRAEL, *Judaism,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1927.

MOORE, GEORGE FOOT, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era,* 2 vols., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1927.

JOSEPH, MORRIS, *Judaism as Creed and Life,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1924.

ENELOW, H. G., *The Adequacy of Judaism,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1929.

KOHLER, K., *Jewish Theology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

KOLLER, ARMIN H., *The Foundations of Jewish Ethics,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

PHILIPSON, DAVID, *The Reform Movement in Judaism,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1907.

WAXMAN, MEYER, *A History of Jewish Literature,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1930.

JEWISH HISTORY

GRAETZ, H., *History of the Jews,* 5 vols., Hebrew Publishing Company, New York, 1926.

MARGOLIS, M. L., and MARX, A., *History of the Jewish People,* Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1926.

DUBNOW, S. M., *Jewish History,* Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1903.

GOODMAN, PAUL, *History of the Jews,* E. P. Dutton & Company, New York, 1927.

LEVINGER, ELMA and LEE J., *The Story of the Jew,* Behrman's Bookshop, New York, 1929.

ELBOGEN, ISMAR, *History of the Jews after the Fall of the Jewish State,* Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, 1926.

BEVEN, EDWYN R., and SINGER, CHARLES, eds., *The Legacy of Israel,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1927.

BROWNE, LEWIS, *Stranger than Fiction,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927.

SILVER, M., *Justice and Judaism in the Light of Today,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1928.

ABRAHAMS, I., *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1897.

PHILIPSON, DAVID, *Old European Jewries,* Jewish Publication Society, Cincinnati, 1894.

RAISIN, MAX, *History of the Jews in Modern Times,* Jewish Publication Society, Cincinnati, 1926.

SILVER, ABBA HILLEL, *The Democratic Impulse in Jewish History,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1928.

SILVER, ABBA HILLEL, *Messianic Speculation in Israel,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927.

THE JEWS

ZANGWILL, ISRAEL, *Dreamers of the Ghetto,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1898.

ZANGWILL, ISRAEL, *Ghetto Tragedies,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1893.

ZANGWILL, ISRAEL, *Israel, the Voice of Jerusalem,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921.

WIRTH, LOUIS, *The Ghetto,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1928.

LEWISOHN, LUDWIG, *Israel,* Boni & Liveright, New York, 1925.

GODBEY, ALLEN H., *The Lost Tribes a Myth,* Duke University Press, Durham, N. C., 1930.

JACOBS, JOSEPH, *Jewish Contributions to Civilization,* Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1919.

CALISCH, EDWARD N., *The Jew in English Literature,* Bell Book and Stationery Company, Richmond, Va., 1909.

PHILIPSON, DAVID, *The Jew in English Fiction,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1918.

KALLEN, HORACE, *Frontiers of Hope,* Horace Liveright, New York, 1929.

ANTIN, MARY, *The Promised Land,* Houghton, Mifflin Company, New York, 1917.

LEBESON, ANITA L'OMAN, *Jewish Pioneers in America,* Brentano's, New York, 1931.

PALLIÉRE, A., *The Unknown Sanctuary,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1928.

KOHUT, REBEKAH, *My Portion,* Boni & Liveright, New York, 1912.

KOHUT, REBEKAH, *As I Know Them,* Doubleday, Doran & Company, New York, 1929.

LEWISOHN, LUDWIG, *The Island Within,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1928.

WISE, JAMES WATERMAN, (Analyticus) *Jews Are Like That,* Brentano's, New York, 1929.

HERTZ, I. H., *Book of Jewish Thoughts,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1920.

FLEG, EDMUND, *The Jewish Anthology,* Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 1925.

COHEN, ISRAEL, *Jewish Life in Modern Times,* Dodd, Mead & Company, New York, 1929.

JEWISH CLASSICS

DEUTSCH, EMANUEL, *Talmud,* Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1919.

DARMSTETER, A., *Talmud,* Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1919.

MAIMONIDES, *Guide to the Perplexed,* Translation by Friedlander, M., E. P. Dutton & Company, New York.

JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS, *Antiquities of the Jews,* Bigelow, Brown & Company, New York, 1924.

JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS, *The Jewish Wars,* Bigelow, Brown & Company, New York, 1924.

GORFINKLE, J., *Sayings of the Fathers,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1923.

ZIONISM

SAMUEL, MAURICE, *What Happened in Palestine,* The Stratford Company, Boston, 1929.

SAMUEL, MAURICE, *On the Rim of the Wilderness,* Horace Liveright, New York, 1931.

HOLMES, JOHN HAYNES, *Palestine Today and Tomorrow,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

WISE, STEPHEN S., and DE HAAS, JACOB, *The Great Betrayal,* Brentano's, New York, 1930.

LOUDRES, ALBERT, *The Jew Has Come Home,* Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1931.

CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

HERFORD, R. TRAVERS, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1928.

LANDMAN, I., edited by, *Christian and Jew,* Horace Liveright, Inc., New York, 1929.

CONNING, J. S., *Our Jewish Neighbors,* Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1927.

MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G., *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.

PARKES, JAMES W., *The Jew and his Neighbour,* Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1931.

DANBY, HERBERT (Julia Frankau), *The Jew and Christianity,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927.

BLACK, J., and others, *The Christian Approach to the Jew,* International Missionary Council, New York, 1927.

GAVIN, FRANK, *Jewish Antecedents to the Christian Sacrament,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928.

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

BARTON, GEORGE A., *Archaeology and the Bible,* American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia, 1916.

COBURN, CAMDEN M., *The New Archaeological Discoveries,* Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1917.

DUNCAN, GEORGE S., *Introduction to Biblical Archaeology,* Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1928.

WORKS OF REFERENCE

Jewish Encyclopedia, edited by Singer, Isadore, Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1925.

PERIODICALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Information Service, Sept. 21 and Nov. 23, 1929.

National Conference of Jews and Christians, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

Committee on Good Will between Jews and Christians, 105 E. 22 St., New York City.

Tract Commission of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Rabbi George Zepin, Cincinnati.

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, 50 West 77 St., New York City.

Zionist Organization, 111 Fifth Ave., New York City.

Friends of Justice in Palestine (The Arab Position), Room 2150, 233 Broadway, New York City.

Foreign Policy Association, 18 E. 41st St., New York City.

INDEX

Aaron, 172, 206, 209
Absorption, 117
Accessions to Judaism, 312, 313
Achad Ha'am (Asher Ginsburg), 323
Accretions, 91, 92, 156
Acre, 26, 58, 60
Adler, Felix, 384
Aeroplanes, 37
Agrippa II, 270, 278
Ahijah, 100
Akhenaten, 109, 190
Akiba (Aqiba), Rabbi, 209
Aksa, el-, 46, 47, 353
Albanian, 7
Alexander the Great, 11, 131, 135, 197, 198, 258, 265
Alexander III, 322
Alexander Jannaeus, 13, 210
Alexandra, 210
Alexandria, 11, 12, 117, 192, 198, 265
Allenby, Gen. Lord, 63, 332, 357
Amorites, 72, 74, 78, 82, 83, 88
Animals in Palestine, 34
Antioch, 11, 200
Antiochus III, 200
Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, 13, 200, 202, 203
Antipater, 13, 211, 212, 258
Antony, Mark, 212, 259
Apocalypses, 205, 220, 221, 263, 269, 274
Apocrypha, 220, 223
Apostles, 251
Appreciation of the Jews, 21
Aqiba (Akiba), Rabbi, 277
Arab Congresses, 376
Arabia, 345
Arabic language and culture, 346, 347
Arabs, 21, 47, 63, 65, 84, 180, 295, 316, 337, 346, 348, 353, 364, 367
Arab States, 353, 357
Aramaic language, 128, 137, 138, 144, 199, 216, 219, 222, 237
Archaeology, 67
Arch of Titus, 273, 276
Aristobulus, 209
Art, 230
Artaxerxes I, 4, 134, 139
Artaxerxes II, 5, 144
Artaxerxes III, 9, 190
" Ascension of Isaiah," 263
Askelon, 26, 88
Asmon (Hasmon), Mattathias, 201
" Assumption of Moses," 263
Assyria, 3, 90, 100, 101, 105, 107
Augustus, Emperor, 259

Baalism, 39
Babylonia, 3, 5, 76, 101, 112, 115, 117, 122, 124, 141, 153, 163, 175, 219, 282, 283, 284, 294
Badges of shame, 19, 290, 299, 396
Bahais, 67
Baibars, 59
Baldwin, 52, 53, 56
Balfour declaration, 64, 325, 326, 337, 338, 350, 358, 359, 362, 363, 364, 368, 369, 375, 379
Balfour, Lord J., 64, 362
Baptism, 240, 347, 306
Bar Cochba, Joseph, 18, 45, 277
Baruch, book of, 223, 263
Beersheba, 24
Bernard of Clairveaux, 55, 293
Bethlehem, 236
Bible, 220, 225
Bible (see Scripture)
Biblical sites, 67
Bishops, 278
B'nai Brith, 297
"Book of the Covenant," 103, 171, 172
Boycott, 372
Brandeis, Justice L. D., 338

British Administration of Palestine, 64, 65, 326, 338, 339, 356, 361, 363, 367
Buddhism, 176, 247
Byzantine empire, 48

Cabala (caballa), 311
Caesarea, 236, 267, 275, 278
Caligula (Caius), Emperor, 262, 265
Caliphate, 317, 345, 356
Canaan, 25, 71, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83
Canon, 150, 220
Canticles, Song of Songs, 219
Carmel, 26
Change of names, 7, 159, 160
Characteristics of Jews, 20
Chariots, 35
Charlemagne, 49, 54, 290, 347
Castles, 54, 59
China, 168, 183
Chosroes II (Khosru), 47, 291
Christian, 7, 129
Christianity, 12, 14, 16, 42, 86, 102, 157, 224, 246, 247, 251, 278, 395
Christians, 245, 251, 256, 266, 269, 280
Christian Science, 313
Christmas, 17
Chronicler, 98, 106, 109, 122, 123, 124, 127, 136, 137, 140, 141, 145, 149, 150, 156, 169, 170, 175, 179, 186, 187, 193, 197, 216, 219
Chronicles, 115, 122, 135, 217, 218
Church, 12, 163, 174, 401
Circumcision, 152, 164, 200, 209, 276, 277
Classes of Jews, 387, 388
Claudius, Emperor, 266, 294, 305
Climate, 30
Coffee, R. I., 402
Colonies, Jewish, 319, 328, 329, 365
Columbus, Christopher, 302, 396
Constantine, 46, 251, 278
Constantinople (Istanbul), 46, 51, 52, 345
Constantius, 287
Conversion of Jews, 297, 298
Crimean war, 63
Cromwell, Oliver, 304
Crucifixion, 245, 301
Crusades, 23, 30, 51, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 124, 292, 293, 344
Cyrus, 121, 122, 123, 135, 142, 153, 155, 219

Dan, 24
Daniel, book of, 121, 128, 138, 192, 221, 222, 233, 262
Dante, 181
Darius I, 127, 134
Darius II, 193
David, 2, 74, 89, 90, 91, 97, 99, 134, 168, 169, 170, 175
Dead Sea, 27, 28, 29, 330
Defamation of Jews, 396, 397
Defections from Judaism, 313
Delta, 72, 75, 78
Deportation, 98
Deuteronomy, 4, 5, 93, 108, 109, 118, 143, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 178, 194
Diaspora, 16, 41, 255
Disciples, 15, 16, 241
Dispersion, 19, 78, 97, 101, 110, 112, 131, 154, 179, 192, 274, 279, 280, 282, 302, 307, 308
Disraeli, 1, 292
Dome of the Rock (" Mosque of Omar "), 48, 52, 62, 350, 360
Domitian, Emperor, 276, 281
Druses, 50, 62

Earthquake, 32
Easter, 17
Ecclesiastes, book of, 219
Ecclesiasticus, book of, 220
Edom, 137
Edomites (Idumeans), 8, 13, 41, 74, 106, 120, 128, 161, 184, 189, 204, 210, 211, 218
Education, Jewish, 331, 389, 398
Egypt, 3, 4, 10, 11, 23, 37, 56, 72, 75, 76, 78, 79, 88, 90, 98, 109, 111, 114, 116, 117, 133, 153, 191, 198, 199, 200, 203, 220, 265, 346, 377
Einstein, A., 1, 379, 395
Elephantine, 11, 116, 117, 142, 154
Emperor worship, 289
England, 19
Enoch, book of, 221, 262
Epistle of Jeremy, 223
" Eretz Israel," 375
Esdraelon, 29

Esdras, 263
Essenes, 40, 208, 240
Esther, book of, 83, 191, 196, 220, 233
Evangelism, 280
Excavation, 67, 68
Exile, 115, 122, 135, 283
Ezekiel, book of, 3, 5, 10, 83, 112, 113, 120, 154, 175, 192, 221, 232
Ezra, scribe, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 40, 110, 117, 132, 136, 138, 140, 144, 146, 152, 154, 164, 186, 187, 195, 207, 208, 215, 219, 227, 266
Ezra, book of, 122, 135, 217

Faith of Jesus, 248, 250
Famagusta, 58
Family records, 181, 182, 183
Feasts, 150, 228, 237
Federal Council of Churches, 401
Feisal, 361, 373, 374
Ferdinand of Spain, 289, 296, 300
Filene, E. A., 401
Flowers of Palestine, 31
Forestation, 32
Fourth Gospel (see John, Gospel of)
France, 296, 304, 358
Future of Jews, 404

Galilee, 24, 26, 42, 268, 281
"Galilee Man," 68
Galilee, Sea of, 27
Gaza, 59, 63, 88
Gedaliah, 113
Gemara, 285
Genealogies, 8, 96, 137, 145, 146, 170, 177, 178, 179, 184, 185, 188, 211, 219
Genghis Khan, 289, 347
Gerizim, 9, 42, 193, 196, 205
Germany, 63, 306
Gersonides, 311
Ghetto, 20, 159, 275, 288, 292, 386
Giants, 74, 75
Godfrey de Bouillon, 52, 53, 124
Gospels, 237, 240
Grand Mufti, 354, 366, 373
Greece, 86, 99, 157, 197
Greek language and culture, 6, 11, 12, 129, 131, 198, 199, 213, 219, 220, 238, 265
"Great Synagogue," 208, 209

Hadrian, Emperor, 18, 43, 45, 277, 291
Haggai, book of, 3, 116, 125, 127, 134, 138, 193
Harems, 92
Hasmoneans (see Asmoneans, Maccabees), 13, 14
Hattin, battle of, 55, 57
Haroun al-Rashid, 49, 290, 347
Hebrew language, 12, 128, 131, 199, 216, 220, 222, 224, 237, 295, 323, 334, 335, 336
Hebrews, people, 4, 8, 39, 71, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 88, 95, 97, 114, 118, 120, 151, 157, 161, 162, 166, 168
Hebrews, heritage of, 40; physical characteristics, 85; religion, 162
Hebron, 73, 161, 345, 366
Helena, 46, 278
Hellenism, 40
Heraclius, Emperor, 47, 48
Hermon, Mt., 30
Herod the Great, 13, 41, 42, 196, 212, 214, 258, 260
Herods, the, 43, 204, 210
Herodian buildings, 44
Herzl, Theodore, 323, 324
Hexeteuch, 284
Hezekiah, 107, 109, 128
"High places," 166
Hijaz, 357, 373
Hillel, Rabbi, 282
Hirsch, Baron, 1, 319
Hittites, 73, 74, 78, 85, 87, 129
"Holiness," Law of, 177
Holofernes, 190
"Holy Cross Day," 305, 306
Holy Sepulchre, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 57, 59, 301
"Homeland" ideal, 358, 375
Husein, Sherif, 355, 356, 357, 361, 374
Hyksos, 72, 73, 78
Hymns, Hebrew national, 86
Hyrcanus, John, 42, 204, 212
Hyrcanus II, 210

Ibn Saud, 355, 373, 374
India, 183
Infiltration, 189
Innocent III, Pope, 293
Inquisition, 19, 300, 308

Intermarriage, 4, 5, 7, 79, 81, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 110, 128, 139, 142, 144, 148, 149, 151, 189, 193, 266, 287, 297
Isabella, Queen, 298, 300, 301
Isaiah, book of, 95, 104, 107, 126
Isaiah II, 3, 10, 15, 121, 125, 126, 193, 232
Isaiah III, 9, 164, 190, 192, 217
Isis, 18
Islam, 47, 56, 84, 86, 157, 230, 344, 345, 374
Israel, kingdom of, 3, 39, 86, 90, 94, 97, 100, 102, 104, 119
Italy, 130, 305
Italian, 6
Italians, 181
Izates, 231

Jacob, 85, 177
Juddua, 135, 197
Jahveh, 11, 22, 162
Jamnia, 18, 20, 273, 277, 281, 283, 314, 333
Jehoiachin, 111
Jehoikim, 111
Jehu, 38
Jeremiah, book of, 10, 104, 111, 112, 114, 125, 192
Jeroboam I, 178
Jeroboam II, 98
Jerusalem, 3, 10, 15, 18, 26, 27, 42, 63, 64, 74, 89, 90, 91, 98, 106, 112, 113, 116, 118, 123, 125, 128, 132, 136, 163, 174, 179, 180, 197, 211, 256, 269, 272
Jesus, 14, 15, 17, 70, 163, 187, 215, 223, 225, 236, 241, 244, 245, 247, 250, 286, 402
Jewish classes, 317, 318, 320, 390
Jewish colonies (see Colonies)
Jews, 117, 125, 129, 130, 151, 179, 184, 191, 203, 218, 266
Jews victims of the crusades, 52
Jewish traits and characteristics, 7, 158, 159
Jihad, holy war, 56, 356
Job, book of, 217
Joel, book of, 10, 190, 217, 233
Johannan ben Zakkai, Rabbi, 273
John the Baptist, 15, 240, 241, 252
John, Gospel of, 16
John, king of England, 303
Jonah, book of, 15, 218, 234
Jordan, river, 24, 27, 28, 29, 42, 80
Josephus, 8, 18, 186, 209, 252, 267
Joshua, book of, 74, 81, 82
Joshua, priest, 3, 123, 126, 135
Josiah, 109, 118, 171, 172, 189
Jubilees, book of, 222
Judah, province of, 13, 124, 125, 133, 135
Judah, kingdom of, 3, 39, 90, 94, 97, 102, 105, 106, 107, 112, 123
Judea, 26, 42
Judaism, 5, 13, 17, 40, 86, 102, 132, 133, 147, 154, 157, 162, 163, 165, 178, 186, 198, 199, 204, 224, 225, 246, 247, 251, 255, 256, 278, 283, 285, 286, 341, 381
Judges, 89, 170
Judges, book of, 81
Judith, book of, 222
Julian, Emperor, 46
Julius Caesar, 211, 212, 258

Karo, Joseph, 312
Keith-Roach, E., 375
Khanuka, 228
Kimchi, David, 311
Knights Hospitallers, 54
Knights of St. John, 47, 54
Knights Templar, 52, 54
Knossos, 87
Koran, 86, 345

Ladino, 317
Ladder of Tyre, 26
Lamentations, book of, 352
Languages of Jews, 309
Lateran Councils, 19, 287
Latin language and culture, 216, 130
Latin kingdom, 53, 56, 57
Law of Moses, 136, 150, 193, 284
Laws, 151
Lawrence, Thos. E., 63, 64, 357
League of Nations, 65, 359, 368, 372, 402
Lebanon, Mt., 24
Leontopolis, 202, 265, 268
Lessing, G. E., 400
Levi, tribe, 8, 169, 172, 177, 204
Levi, H., 402
Levita, E., 311

Levites, 5, 14, 40, 80, 136, 145, 148, 167, 171, 172, 175, 176, 178, 206
Literature, 118, 134
London, 288
Lord's Supper, 247
Lost tribes, 81, 101

Maccabaeus, Judas, 43, 201, 203
Maccabee, Jonathan, 202
Maccabee, Simon, 202, 204
Maccabees, 12, 40, 45, 90, 105, 148, 155, 189, 196, 201, 202, 204, 205, 210, 215, 224, 228, 229, 235, 258, 263
Maccabees, books of, 202, 222
MacDonald, Ramsay, 370, 371
Mack, J. W., 338
Madeba map, 46
Magnes, Chancellor Judah L., 334, 337, 379
Maimonides, 1, 294, 310
Malachi, book of, 4, 128, 143, 193
Malta, 54
Manasseh, 108
Mann, Rabbi, Louis L., 402
Mariamne, 14, 212, 215
Marranos, 298, 299, 302, 308
Masada, 267, 276
Massacres of Jews, 97, 292, 293, 297
Massacres of Jews by crusaders, 52, 58
MacMahon, Sir H., 64, 356
Mandates, 65
Mazdaism, 153
Mecca, 47, 84, 346, 374
Megiddo (Armageddon), 30, 64
Melchizedek, 168
Mendelssohn, Moses, 312
"Merchant of Venice," 304
Merneptah, 78
Mesopotamia, 20, 23, 115
Messianic hope, 206, 263, 264, 287, 305, 308, 393
Michelson, A. A., 395
Migration, 11, 77, 78, 85
Mikado, 184
Minerals of Palestine, 32, 33
Miracle, 82, 177
Mishna, 274, 285, 286
Missions to Jews, 398
Mixed stock (see Racial mixtures)
Moab, 137, 218, 234
Moabite Stone, 37
Modein, 13
Mohammed, 47, 345, 351
Monotheism, 151, 193, 195, 224, 231, 266
Montefiore, Sir Moses, 320, 351
Moors, 19, 295, 300, 301, 302
Moses, 79, 80, 82, 85, 167, 169, 173, 194, 244, 247, 253, 254, 284
Moses, Laws of (see Laws of Moses)
Moslem, Moslems, 7, 47, 67, 129, 292, 344, 355
"Mosque of Omar" (see Dome of the Rock)
Mountains of Palestine, 29, 30
Mussolini, Benito, 6, 129, 130
Mustapha Kemal Pasha, 348, 374

Nabateans, 13, 161, 189
Nablous, 41, 67, 192, 194, 205
Names changed, 7, 305
Napoleon Bonaparte, 62
Nazareth, 215, 236, 238
Nazarenes, 42, 252, 253
Nebuchadrezzar (Nebuchadnezzar), 111, 113, 135, 222
Negeb, 25, 120
Negro Jews, 313
Nehemiah, 1, 4, 8, 40, 90, 132, 136, 138, 139, 140, 142, 144, 154, 156, 216, 219
Nehemiah, book of, 122, 134, 135, 193, 216
Nehemiah, Journal of, 4
Nero, Emperor, 45, 266, 268, 269, 281
Nethinim, 172
New Testament, 14, 16, 86, 285
Nineveh, 234
Normans, 82
Nubia, 11

Old Testament, 7, 72, 134, 238, 315
Oliphant, Lawrence, 320
Omar, caliph, 47, 48
Onias III, 117, 200, 202, 230
Orthodox Jews, 386, 390, 391, 394

Pale, Jewish, 159, 307
Palestine, 16, 21, 23, 24, 26, 62, 65, 80, 83, 84, 88, 91, 97, 100, 103, 104, 114, 119, 124, 129, 132, 166, 235, 282, 314, 356, 403
Palestine, cities of, 65, 66

Palestine, history, 38
Palestine, population, 34, 41, 325, 344
Palestine, products and resources, 31, 33, 35, 377
Palestine, races, 71, 74, 75, 148
Palestine, religious interest of, 68
Palestine, subjugations of, 38
Palestine, travel to, 69
Papyri, 116
Parthians, 45
Passfield, Lord, 370
Passover, 17, 269, 391
Patois in Judah, 5
Paul, 16, 187, 188, 237, 246, 251, 254, 398
Pedigrees, 13
Pella, 269, 278
Pentateuch, 150, 193
Perea, 41, 42
Pericles, 7
Persecution of Jews, 2, 7, 17, 18, 19, 200, 279, 297, 299, 300, 307, 396, 397, 404
Persia, 3, 4, 11, 47, 115, 127, 139, 141, 153, 157, 190, 191, 196, 197, 234
Petra, 161, 189
Pharisees, 16, 40, 205, 214, 227, 229, 234, 239, 245, 264, 274
Philistia, Philistines, 26, 87, 88, 89, 91, 98, 106, 107, 120, 126
Philo, 117, 265, 309, 311
Pilate, 262
Pilgrims, 50, 122, 126, 153, 167
Pius IX, Pope, 306
Pogroms, 307, 392
Poland, 397, 398
Pompedita, 20
Pompey, 13, 41, 43, 210, 211, 258
Pope, 51
Prejudice against Jews, 20
Priest Code, 5, 119, 145, 148, 150, 174, 177, 178, 195, 217
Priests, Priesthood, 16, 40, 83, 138, 145, 154, 155, 162, 163, 166, 169, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 185, 186, 190, 194, 195, 202, 206, 210, 227, 229, 260
Prince Judah, Rabbi, 282
Procurators, 44, 260, 264, 267
Prophets, 15, 39, 94, 102, 121, 160, 162, 193, 247
Proselytes, 162, 231, 247
Psalms, 4, 9, 120, 128, 190, 195, 208, 217
Psalms of Solomon, 222
Ptolemy I. Soter, 199
Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, 12, 220
Ptolemy III. Euergetes, 199
Purim, 196, 228

Rabbinic schools, 209
Rabbis, 261, 281, 283, 311
Race continuity, 6
Race mixtures, 2, 6, 9, 20, 77, 82, 83, 84, 94, 99, 106, 110, 119, 139, 143, 156, 160, 178, 184, 226, 383, 384
Racial traits, 383, 385
Railroads in Palestine, 25, 29, 37, 63
Ramses III, 88
Rashi, 310
Reform Judaism, 390, 392
Rehoboam, 98, 100
Relics of saints, 61
Remnant in Palestine, 127
"Return" to Palestine, 3, 135, 164, 315, 316
Reuchlin, Johann, 312
Rhodes, 54
Richard, Coeur de Lion, 57, 58, 303
Roads in Palestine, 27, 35, 36, 43
Rockefeller, John D., Jr., 68
Roman Catholic church, 51, 61, 130, 247, 295, 390
Roman empire, government, 6, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 26, 35, 41, 42, 43, 46, 86, 99, 129, 148, 157, 210, 203, 204, 209, 212, 213, 235, 236, 238, 239, 256, 258, 261, 263, 264, 266, 268, 270, 281, 288, 348
Roman emperors, 262
Rome, Jews in, 305
Rosenwald, Julius, 1
Rosh ha-Shanah, 391
Rothschild, Baron, 320, 322, 325
Russia, Jews in, 306, 307, 322
Ruth, book of, 218, 234

Sabbath, 119, 143, 150, 152, 164, 196, 201, 208, 280, 287, 352, 392
Sacrifice, 167
Sadducees, 40, 206, 207, 214, 227, 234
Safed, 18, 20, 273, 278, 314, 366
Saladin, 56, 58, 180, 310, 348

Samaria, 26, 97, 99, 106, 192, 213, 224, 282
Samaritans, 9, 41, 42, 67, 103, 119, 135, 141, 150, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 199, 204, 224, 225, 265, 291, 301, 346
Samson, 89
Samuel-Kings, books of, 118, 137, 138, 218
Samuel, Sir Herbert, 65, 324, 338, 359, 375
Sanhedrin, 40, 209, 229, 236, 273, 274
Sanballat, 142
Sargon II, 100, 101, 183
Saul, 89
Saul, apostle (see Paul)
Scribes, 16, 40, 145, 196, 207, 284
Scripture, 4, 12, 161, 185, 196, 220, 242, 252, 390
Semites, 72, 77, 84, 88, 166, 180, 346
Sennacherib, 107
Sepphoris, 268, 278, 283, 314
Septuagint, 12, 117, 220, 265
Sèvres, treaty of, 64
Shalmaneser IV, 100
Shaw, Sir W., 366, 370
Shechem, 82
Shema, 391
Shephela, 26
Sheshbazzar, 122
Shiloh, 170, 171
Shishak, 98
Shishak Inscription, 37
Shulchan Aruch, 312, 323, 391, 393
"Shylock," 397
Sibylline Oracles, 263
Siloam Inscription, 37
Silver, Rabbi A. H., 403
Sinai, Mt., 172, 284, 356
Sirach, 1
Slaughter of Jews, 272, 273, 276
Slaves, 90, 111, 293
Smith, Sir George Adam, 98
Smith, Professor W. R., 180
Sonenfeld, Chief Rabbi, 373
Sokolow, N., 340
Solomon, 2, 38, 91, 95, 97, 99, 214, 272, 351
Spain, Jews in, 19, 50, 294, 296
Spinoza, Baruch, 1, 312, 395
Stephen, 16, 251, 253
St. John, Knights of (see Knights of St. John)
Straus, Nathan, 1, 340, 395
Suez Canal, 355, 369
Suleman, sultan, 62
Sura, 20, 333
Susa, 140
Synagogue, 208, 237, 243, 265, 275, 280, 318, 353, 393, 401
Syria, 11, 13, 25, 43, 65, 75, 98, 198, 199, 200, 201

Tabor, Mt., 29
Tacitus, 272
Talmud, 86, 179, 188, 284, 285, 391, 393
Tamerlane, 61, 289
Tel-Aviv, 328, 360, 366
Tell el-Amarna, 37, 117
Temple, the, 3, 14, 18, 42, 45, 91, 112, 123, 126, 127, 137, 139, 141, 143, 147, 152, 154, 161, 163, 174, 175, 190, 193, 195, 200, 201, 203, 206, 208, 211, 214, 226, 227, 229, 239, 243, 252, 260, 261, 268, 269, 271, 350
Testimonies of the Twelve Patriarchs, 263
Theudas, 264
Tiberias, 18, 20, 273, 278, 283, 285, 314
Tiglath Pileser, 100
Titus, Emperor, 18, 42, 45, 269, 270, 271, 275, 314
Tobit, book of, 222
Toleration, acts of, 307
Torah, 14, 145, 147, 163, 194, 195, 205, 228, 239, 244, 246, 273, 274, 287, 404
Tours, battle of, 296
Trajan, Emperor, 277
Tribes, 81, 85, 95, 96, 137, 186, 187, 282
Turkey, Turks, 7, 50, 55, 61, 62, 64, 316, 327, 344, 349, 353

Unitarianism, 313, 394
University, Hebrew, 331, 332, 333, 379
Usury, 291, 292
Urban II, pope, 51
"Urim and Thummim," 173

Venice, 288, 305
Vespasian, Emperor, 18, 45, 268, 269
Virgil, 181

Wailing Wall, 65, 214, 317, 350, 351, 353, 354, 365, 366, 372
Walls, city, 136, 140, 141, 142, 211, 213, 270
" Wandering Jew," 147
Warburg, Felix M., 31, 32, 340, 371
Water Supply, 31, 340, 371
Weizmann, Chaim, 332, 340, 371, 372
" White Paper," 370, 371, 372
William II, kaiser, 63
Wisdom of Solomon, book of, 219
Wise, Rabbi Stephen S., 338, 402
World War, 23

Yahu, Ya'u, 11, 116, 117, 154
Yiddish, 131, 317, 335

Zadok, 172
Zealots, 17, 263
Zechariah, book of, 3, 9, 116, 125, 134, 138, 140
Zechariah II, book of, 221
Zedekiah, king, 113, 123
Zephaniah, book of, 221
Zerubbabel, 3, 42, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 135, 136, 142, 155, 214
Zion, section of Jerusalem, 15, 125, 350, 402
Zionism, 21, 23, 65, 321, 326, 336, 349, 350, 370, 375, 377, 395
Zionist congresses, 339
Zoroaster, 153, 206, 234

Date Due

FE 25 '52

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01015 7701